

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1877.

ART. I.—THE CHANNEL ISLANDS.

1. *The Channel Islands.* By DAVID THOMAS ANSTED, M.A., F.R.S., and late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, and ROBERT GORDON LATHAM, M.A., M.D., F.R.S., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. With Illustrations drawn by Paul J. Naftel, Member of the London Society of Painters in Water-colours. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1862.
2. *A Legend of St. Helier, Hermit in Jersey.* By the late Rev. J. B. DALGAIRNS, in the Oxford Series of Lives of English Saints. London: J. Toovey. 1844.
3. *Dictionnaire Franco-Normand; ou, Recueil des Mots particuliers au Dialecte de Guernesey, faisant voir leurs Relations Romanes, Celtiques, et Tudesques.* Par GEORGES METIVIER, Membre de la Société Philologique de Londres. Williams & Norgate, London and Edinburgh. 1870.

THE Channel Islands form one of those parts of the British Home Empire, if we may use the expression, which possess a special interest, as still preserving traces of those remote times in which that process of aggregation was going on, which made the Empire what it is. Or rather, they are fragments of the "almost kingly Dukedom," from which the aggregation took its point of departure. This little, but not humble group, can say of itself: "I represent Normandy, whence the Conqueror went forth who reduced England under his dominion. The lions which England quarters are my original arms." It shares indeed with the Palatinates of Chester and Durham, with the Duchy of Cornwall, nay, with the Principality of Wales, the honour of being one of the recognizable elements which make up the collective whole, but has retained its individuality far more than they have done, since it has its own legislation, even as in the days of the Plantagenets, just as Lanuvium, a little city of Latium, retained its dictator when the Roman Republic had spread its

wings over the world. Such communities must be worthy the study of the politician and historian. They illustrate a law of social development, which we have called that of aggregation, the *synoikismós* of the Greeks, by which in the world, new political wholes are continually being formed out of once discordant elements. The process is no doubt painful. All such unions force together units that would prefer to be distinct, and which retain more or less their tendency to separation, after an evidently new creation has come into existence to supersede them. English "county" feeling is but the unconscious continuance of the patriotism of the Northumbrian, the East Anglian, the Kentish man, the Saxon of the South or of the West. Even yet the English type is far from being so completely one as it will be some time or other, before our history has run its race. And then, unless conquest supervenes, a period of disintegration will arise, even as, in the middle ages, there rose once more free cities in Italy, the history of which reads like the early books of Livy over again. We feel, however, that this preface is running to a length that might suit a book rather than an article, and that the reader will willingly see it cut short, and desire us to descend not indeed *in medias res*, but rather to the more prosaic preliminary duty of giving him a sort of index to the task which we are attempting.

Briefly then, we propose to give such notices (1) of those physical features of the Norman archipelago, and particularly Guernsey, as may suggest to the summer-voyager what he should look for; (2) to remark some interesting particulars connected with the Norman *patois* still spoken in this island; (3) to give some idea of what is known, or may be inferred, of their early history, particularly with reference to the *primordia* of the population and the period of their conversion to Christianity; (4) the most striking events connected with them in later times, and the leading points of the insular constitution and social manners. Our chief authority is Messrs. Ansted and Latham's "Channel Islands"; but we have been, as will be perceived, largely indebted to the elaborate glossary of the very learned insular scholar, M. Georges Métivier.

The Channel Islands constitute a very much more numerous group than is commonly supposed by such geographers as perhaps are the majority of those to whom their name is familiar. With them, the name stands for Jersey, Guernsey, and Alderney, and perhaps they may remember enough of school lessons to add Sark, Herm, and Jethou. But in reality these are only the

most important members of a far larger assemblage, dispersed over an area of about 3,000 square miles. Professor Ansted reckons four groups: (1) the Northern, including Alderney, Burhou, and the Casquets; (2) North-central, Guernsey, Herm, and Sark; (3) South-central, Jersey and her daughters; (4) Southern, the Minquiers, and Chaussey islands. But all these have depending on them numerous rocks, ledges or islets, or shoals, of which three groups connect the north of Jersey with France. Seven or eight of the islands are regularly inhabited, and several others occasionally in the summer. Of islands, or groups of islands having names, it appears that about twenty-one may be reckoned.

A political writer of note—we forget his name at this moment—said that, given the climate and physical conditions of any country, he could *a priori* construct its history. Considering that man is the lord of nature, this was far too ambitious a boast, and indeed it is shown to be so by the varying fortunes of the tenants of the same soils throughout ten centuries. But that it is, to a certain extent, founded on probability, is equally obvious; and the character and fortunes of the Channel Islands are a striking example of this. Take first—which indeed is the most obvious feature to the superficial observer, and one at many periods of history of the least consequence, but of much at our stage of civilization—their natural beauty, attracting visitors, and so having, directly or indirectly, a great effect on their prosperity. Can there be a lovelier prospect than an archipelago of small islands, scattered over an azure sea in the brightness of a summer's day? On landing on one of them, what can be more delightful than the rocky bays and inlets with which their coasts are pierced, and the long winding ravines leading upwards to the smiling fields? All these are caused by certain singular geological conditions, which absent, all would be altered.

The smallness of the islands is a cause which must obviously greatly affect the social state, as tending on the one hand to minute subdivisions of property and the formation of a class of peasant-proprietors, and on the other, driving out many to seek their fortunes in the wide world without. Again, the proximity of this little archipelago to France has of course resulted in its occupation by a race of the same origin and language as those on the Continent, whilst their importance in a naval and military point of view, rendering their possession essential to the preponderating maritime power of Britain, has operated on their connection for centuries with the latter state, a connection that must rest on

necessity, for the islanders are far from English in their character, although as little disposed to be merged in France as if they were sons of the Saxons. Many reasons have contributed to the continued preservation of political constitutions of a peculiar type in the islands. But all bring us back to their smallness and their situation within sight of the Continent, caused by the working of ocean-tides and the character of their rocks. Yet we repeat, we do not recognize herein the operation of any fated law, "binding men's deeds as in a chain," any more than we suppose that riches make all men self-indulgent, or that poverty makes all men humble or self-assisting, as the case may be. We trace only circumstances, having a certain tendency which might have been anticipated, and is in a considerable degree realized.

The great physical cause in which these circumstances consist is simply this. The islands were once part of the French mainland. They are formed chiefly of hard granite; but this granite is intersected with yet harder veins, and again with veins of softer material than the rest of the mass. The sea constantly dashing for ages against the cliffs, has been able to knock out, beat away, decompose, and disintegrate the portions of softer rock, and dislodge the harder, which would then serve as so many hammers to shatter the surface and carry on the work of destruction. Thus winding bays were formed, and the islands were separated from the Continent and from each other, vast ledges being quite submerged.

The bottom of the sea, were it visible, would offer striking monuments of this history of change, in its pinnacles of rock, and sand-banks with deep valleys between them. An insular region of this type must necessarily afford scenery of a very singular and picturesque character; whilst its navigation must be very difficult, affording an excellent school for a hardy seafaring race. The various islands and groups have all their own special features, and in many instances, of a grandeur such as people go vast distances to observe in quarters where they perhaps find little that merits greater admiration. It is not our object, nor within our powers, to perform the office of a guide-book in any detailed description of particular points of the scenery. But we are able to say, that whilst the islands are so small as to make all the points of interest quite within reach, these points are so numerous, as that even the smaller islands will be found not easily exhaustible, if the traveller really wishes to study them. We would name in Guernsey, above all, Moulin-Huet Bay, with the rocky glen leading down to it, and the rivulets which constitute the latter one of those "water-lanes" so

characteristic of the island scenery; Rocquaine Bay, with its romantic name, so well adapted to its wild, ruinous expanse of rocks and reefs, stretching miles out to sea; Saints' Bay, Fermain Bay, Petit-bot Bay, each with beauties of its own; the cliffs near Pleinmont, with their jagged promontories and narrow isthmuses; the island of Lihou, set off by twelfth-century ruins of a chapel that make it a kind of humble Lindisfarne; in the interior, the quaint cottages, small orchards, minute fields, with cattle economically tethered to eat down their measure of grass fairly; and, when you approach glen or rock, rich colouring everywhere of fern, lichen, and gorse. Then in Sark, the noble Gouliot caverns, with their splendid zoophytes; the singular natural shaft and tunnel to the sea, called the Creux Derrible, the typical specimen of a class of scenery found also in Guernsey and Herm; the tunnel of the Creux Harbour in Sark, where the hand of man has created a feature rivalling in sombre grandeur the corresponding works of nature; the boasted Coupée, a wild precipitous pass with cliffs vertical and sloping, connecting Great and Little Sark, almost everywhere detached cliffs or rocks affording endless occupation for the draughtsman or for those who paint by the pencil of words in novel or in poem—such are some of the objects about which the tourist should seek information beforehand, and visit again and again, till he has thoroughly made such imagery part of the permanent possessions of his imagination.

We proceed to offer some remarks on the curious subject of the French patois spoken in the Channel Islands. Without pretending to original observations founded on anything but the superficial notices of a mere "bird of passage," we feel confident that we shall be able to interest the reader with a few specimens from the rich collection furnished by the Franco-Norman Dictionary of M. Georges Métivier. The present seems a time, all over the civilized world, in which scholars are eager to preserve the linguistic monuments of the past, and in which, by the aid of scientific methods, superior, beyond all comparison, to the vague guesses of philologists of earlier date, we are obtaining a rapidly increasing harvest of very important results. M. G. Métivier's work indeed, now seven or eight years before the public, belongs to a somewhat transitional state, but his knowledge of this singular branch of the French language is perfect, and he has been able to save from oblivion very many curiosities on the point of being lost.

To the unscientific hearer, Guernsey-French seems marked by a good deal of clipping or converting some vowels into diphthongs, or shortening of others before combinations which

ought to make them long, a simplification of the nasal sound (for example, *bring* for the French *brin*), and a preference (like Ionic Greek) for vowels coming together without contraction, particularly the substitution, in infinitives, of the termination *air* for *er*. A few examples in parallel columns will make this clear to the eye.

<i>French.</i>	<i>Anglo-Norman.</i>
Foin.	Fain.
Hisser.	Haïstair.
Chômer.	Choumaïr.
celui-ci.	ch'tin'chin.
Louvier.	Loviaïr.
orgueilleux.	orguillaeux.
pelle.	paille.
cœil.	ieil.
eux.	iaeux.
sucré.	chucré.
mieux.	mâx.
menacer.	m'nichier.
glaner	gllanaïr.
bleu	blu.
recorder (v. fr.)	r'cordaïr.
même fusse	o-fuche.

It has often been said that there are dialectic varieties belonging to each of the ten parishes into which Guernsey is divided. M. Métivier, whilst allowing that not two pronounce precisely in the same manner, says that it would be difficult to give even approximately, an idea of their modes of distinction; but that there is a very appreciable difference between the pronunciation of the people in "the low parishes" situated to the north, and those of "the upper parishes" to the south of the island; so marked indeed that it might serve as a basis for ethnological questions. (See *Notices préliminaires*, where some curious information is given on the pronunciation of Guernsey-French generally, and on certain peculiarities of its conjugations.)

As might be expected, words are borrowed by Guernsey-French straight from the English, and subjected to a sort of chemical change, to assimilate them to the rest of the dialect. Thus *jug* becomes *djouge*. Borrowings, however, like these, though important in their way, are comparatively of little interest. It is rather in its capacity of representative of one of the primitive dialects of old France, than in its symptoms of decay, that the Guernsey-French idiom should be studied.

We shall, however, confine ourselves here to the evidence found in its vocabulary, of the presence of Norwegian elements, as affecting the controversy about the origin of Rollo and his companions in the conquest of the future Normandy. Little trouble is needed to bring together words which tend to verify the common account of their being Norse. Take for instance the word *hougue*, very frequent in Guernsey. It means an eminence, a hillock, a sepulchral mound, and is found indeed in the Norse, Shetlandic, old high German and Danish, but the Guernsey form is nearer to the first of these *haug-r*, or the Shetlandic *heog*, than to the old high German *houe* or *hohe*, or to the Danish *høj*. It meets us perpetually in the nomenclature of the island. Thus, *la Hougue Fouque* or *Foulque*; *Hougue Renouf*, *la Hougue Bou-bigny*; *la Hougue au Paulmier*, *la Hougue Falle*, &c. &c. In the north of Scotland and in Sweden, they give the name of *stack* to detached rocks of pyramidal form which occur at the end of promontories. There are many such about the Channel Islands, called *étac* (the accented *é*, as constantly happens, representing the older combination of *st*). For example, the Etac-ré, near Lihou, the Etacq at Alderney, the Tac or Etac of Sark, &c. One of the Guernsey parishes is called the Vale or *Valle*. This, however, has nothing to do with a valley, but comes from the Norse *Vallr* or *Vall*, meaning a pasturage or grassy enclosure. The Guernsey name for a shark is *haus* or *haù*. The same fish is called in the Shetland islands *hoe*, in Norse, *haa*. M. Métivier quotes the following quaint lines from his MSS.

Nou veyait, à la Grand' Rue,
L'congret frais et la mouarue,
D'longs, laids, maigres, hidaeux *haus*,
Ses cousins, les tchiens roussiaux,
Et l'dravan qui, jouant d' sa coue
Des chancres fouittait la broue.

These verses describe fish for sale in the High-street, the conger, the codfish, the shark, the sea-dog, and the stickle-back. Among nautical terms may be mentioned *halair*, to haul, from the old Norse *hala*; *matnot*, a companion, is the original of *matelot*, and derived from the old Norse *mat-naut*, English, messmate. The Swedish word *hohm*, for a pasture-land near water, or for a peninsula, familiar enough in the north of England, is found in the Guernsey-French word *houmet*, occurring in various localities of the island. One of the De Beauvoir family styled himself *Sieur du Houmet*, from a property so called in St. Sampson's. There was in Alderney

a primitive practice, derived no doubt from the days when Northmen and Hindoos were members of one nation, of plastering the walls of the town of St. Anne with a wash of cowdung. The insular name for this article is *couême*, in Danish (M. Métivier, though suggesting the thing and name may be Norse, gives no Norwegian equivalent), *kuh eme*. The probability is, that the Northern nations, at the time of their piratical invasions of the South, were all much less distinguishable from each other in language and manners than they afterwards became. There is a very curious word in Guernsey for a gift made on the last day of the year, *oguinane*, which is also found in various forms on the neighbouring mainland; at Caen, formerly, *haguignettes*, Norman *hoguinâno*, Lower Brittany *eghinaneit*, &c. Readers of Scott's novels will not have forgotten the corresponding name in the south of Scotland, *hogmanay*, and in Saxon it was *hogen-hyne*. M. Métivier quotes a relic of the expression in a rhyme sung by Guernsey children in petitioning for this gift:—

Oguinâni ! oguinâno !

Ouvre ta pouque, et pis la r'ello ! *

He traces the derivation, perhaps rather fancifully, from *agen*, Engl. *own*, and *hine*, a domestic, Latin *famulus*, comparing the Spanish *aguinaldo*, a new-year's gift, from *agen*, as before, and *ald*, Franco-Teutonic, a serf or vassal.

The article on the famous word *haro* will repay perusal. Whatever conclusion we may arrive at about Rollo and his Northmen, the stock etymology which refers this word to *Ha, Ro!* a sort of appeal to the patriotism of the great leader, is not one which can recommend itself to the taste of a generation whose ears have been accustomed to the mere sound of the school of modern linguistics. Brachet ("Dictionnaire

* With reference to this curious subject, we may quote from the first article in Alban Butler the following illustration, old-fashioned indeed in its etymology, but a remarkable specimen of the out-of-the-way information to be found in that great repertory of learning as well as of devotion:—

"The French name Etrennes is pagan, from *strenæ*, or new year gifts, in honour of the goddess Strenia. The same in Poitou and Perche, anciently the country of the Druids, is derived from their rites. For the Poitevins for Etrennes use the word *Auguislanneuf*, and the Percherons *Equilans*, from the ancient cry of the Druids, *Ou quy l'an neuf!* i.e. *Adviseum, annus novus!* or, To the mistletoe, the new year! when, on new year's day, the Pagans went into the forest to seek the mistletoe on the oak." (Alban Butler, "Lives of the Saints," Jan. 1.)

The form which the word before us had assumed in modern provincial French seems to have arisen from a mistaken etymology, just as from the word *girasole* has been formed the first part of the compound *Jerusalem-artichoke*.

étymologique de la langue française") simply notes against it, *origine inconnue*. M. Métivier makes a bold attempt, first however dismissing, on what appears cogent grounds, its limitation to Normandy. He quotes a Welsh antiquarian work, Roberts' "Collectanea Cambrica," in proof that it was even known to the Kymry. It seems they proclaimed war by the cry *hara*; and he cites many instances of its use in Germanic France, yet not, as it would appear to us, proving that it might not have been derived by the latter from Normandy. His own idea is, that it is a cry borrowed from the sound resembling the rolled *r*, in the barking of an angry dog, and like the hunting-cries *har-levrier*, *har-loup*, referring also to the verbs *harier*, *harer*, to importune. In addition to his remarks, we may refer to the clause "*nonobstant clameur de Haro*," so familiar to readers of old French books in the royal licenses to publishers in the reign of Louis XIV. and downwards to the end of the monarchy.*

The introduction of Christianity into the islands is not capable of easy reduction into the form of history. It is legendary, that is, it has been passed from mouth to mouth in a long series of years, by people who sought to edify each other, who would never wilfully have distorted facts, but who dreamt not of criticism. Ages of a different character require such relations to be given them in a different form, even when faith may be as deep-seated. One thing is noticeable immediately: that the towns and villages in the Channel Islands are all named after some saint. Thus we have St. Peter's Port, St. Sampson's, St. Martin's, St. Helier's, St. Aubin's, St. Brelade's, &c. &c. Dr. Latham draws from this the interesting conclusion, that "the towns which bear such names are comparatively new, that the monastic preceded the municipal institutions, in a word, that they have their origin in the diffusion of the Christian religion; that before they became Christians, they were of small importance, roughly speaking, all but uninhabited." The contrast in the names of the principal towns in France is very striking, which, as is well known, are generally derivable from those of the Gallic tribes of which they had been the centres; thus Vannes of the *Veneti*, Paris of the *Parisii*, Sens of the *Senones*, &c. The fact of a town being named after a saint is alone sufficient

* It appears from Dr. Latham, that the triple repetition of the appeal *Ha! Ro!* is still operative in Jersey, in case of encroachments on property. "If the encroachment is proved, a fine is imposed, and no islander would venture to resist this curious form of injunction, which has been made in some instances within a few years from the present time."—"The Channel Islands," 1862, p. 538.

to show what qualities were admired and influential in those ages, as the nomenclature of new settlements in our own times shows what are our own proclivities, the respect for great statesmen or soldiers, moneyed men, or at best the affectionate remembrance of localities in the mother country. But we take it, after all, the towns were not so much named in honour of saints, as simply, that the saints had been intimately connected with them. St. Helier's was Helier's town, the place where he had lived and laboured long enough to make it, in the thoughts of the simple population, inseparably associated with him. The Channel Islands merit a small hagiology of their own. In many instances it would of course coincide with that of the Breton or Norman mainland, with which their people are identified in origin. But S. Sampson and S. Helier stand out as peculiarly the patron saints of the two larger islands, and as the authors of their Christianization. Dr. Latham has given a sketch of the lives of both from the Bollandists, the tone of which may be judged of by what he probably regards as a considerable concession. After relating various legendary miracles of the first-mentioned saint, he observes that "in the face of so many circumstances as this, and with the principle before us, that *where there is smoke there is fire* (a principle which forbids us to deny in even the most untrustworthy narratives some *scintilla* of fact as a basis), it is unsafe to say that S. Sampson never had a real existence" (p. 320). There is no doubt that whilst all lives of saints are characterized, from their very nature, by the wonderful, and are, to use an expression of F. Newman's, "hung round with miracles," Breton hagiography is peculiarly strange and marvellous. The Bollandist preface to the life of S. Helier has the following remarks in point:—"Non tam est vitæ gestorumque S. Samsonis ordinata ad normam historiæ quam miraculorum prodigiorumque ut sunt pleræque Britannicæ legendæ ad stuporem magis quam ad imitationem collectio, stylo plerumque contorto, obscuro et sæpe barbaro congestæ, ut si appositis annotationibus singula illustrare aut explicare volueris, tantundem fere laboris subire necesse est, ac si totum ab ovo construendam componendamque suscipias" ("Vita S. Helerii," Julii 28). The Protestant or sceptical historian, however, will deal with such legends merely as rubbish, out of which, here and there, a fact may be picked up, the rest serving but for amusement; the Catholic will find in all of them either a lesson, equally true whether conveyed in events which really happened or not, or else an unproved example of Divine power, extraordinary indeed, but not more extraordinary than some which have actually

happened, and which cannot be disbelieved without upsetting the foundations of faith. This discussion, however, must not carry us too far from our subject, and we proceed to give the reader some idea of what is known of S. Helier, the patron saint of the capital of Jersey.

Helerius, better known as S. Helier, lived in the seventh century. He was the son of Sigebert, a noble of Tongres, in what is now Belgium, and Luitgard his wife. They had been long childless, when this son was granted to them on the prayers of S. Cunibert, who made it a condition of their fulfilment that the child should be given up to him to train for the religious life. However, the rude warrior only discharged this promise when the boy, in his seventh year, had been nearly lost to him by ill-health, from which he recovered through the same powerful prayers to which his birth had been accorded. He lived with his holy master until the latter was martyred by the savage followers of Sigebert. After this, Helerius fled to Teroenne, where a pious widow-woman gave him lodging for a short time, until he took up his abode in S. Mary's church in that town, where he led a life of the sternest mortification, rewarded by the gift of miracles. Later, he went to Nanteuil, and took up his abode with S. Marculfus, one of the great missionary-saints to whom the conversion of the Bretons is due, and who baptized him; for hitherto, strange to say, he had been but a catechumen. After three months' stay with S. Marculfus, by the inspiration of God, and at the suggestion of this spiritual father, he, with a companion named Romard, betook himself to the island of Jersey* to lead the life of a hermit; and this event in the history of the saint brings him into connection with the subject of our article. Jersey, in those days, was a wild place, and, according to the Acts, which evidently represent very ancient traditions, had but thirty inhabitants. Here we cannot withhold from the reader the striking description of S. Helier's hermitage, which the late beloved and lamented F. Dalgairns, himself, as is well known, a Channel-islander, wrote before his own reception into the Catholic Church. The book we quote from is, we believe, out of print, and now perhaps almost forgotten, and our quotation from it will derive additional interest from the fact which we happen to know, that F. Dalgairns visited, on purpose to write the life of S. Helier, the scene he has so beautifully described:—

Theirs (Helier and Romard's) were in all likelihood the first Christian feet

* Called in one account Gersut, in another *Agua*. The latter is explained by F. Dalgairns as a mistake for *Augia*, from *au*, the German for a meadow.

which touched the ground of the island. It was the last stronghold of the Celts, where dwelt a thin remnant of the old race which the Franks had conquered. Here, then, in the old haunt of Druid rites, did Helier find himself, with the stone circles and the huge granite altars of a worn-out faith all around him. And now how was he to set up the Cross over these rude relics of an ancient world? He began by bearing it in his own flesh; he fasted and wept all day, and he sung psalms, and kept his thoughts ever fixed on God, and on all the wonders which Christ had wrought. No one who dwelt in king's houses, clad in soft raiment, could have hoped to win the hearts of the rough and simple feeders of cattle who dwelt on the island. It was the rude giant Christopher, says the legend, who bore the infant Jesus, with the globe and cross in his hand, across the swollen stream, and so by rough arts did Helier bring Christ over the fretful waves to these poor islanders. A common missionary might have preached to them for many a year in vain, but Helier certainly took no common way of teaching. He was to be the forerunner of the faith of Christ, and so, like John the Baptist, he lived a supernatural life. The place of his abode was as dreary as the wilderness on the banks of the Jordan. About the middle of what is now St. Aubin's Bay two huge rocks jut into the sea, divided from each other by a dark chasm, and from the island by a sort of causeway. At high tide, however, the water rushes through this chasm, and completely surrounds the rocks, which are thus at certain times wholly cut off from the shore and from each other. On the larger of these huge crags may still be seen Helier's hermitage. It is a rough pile of stones, built on a ledge of the shelving rock, which itself forms one side and the floor of the building. On the side nearest the sea, the thick wall is pierced by an opening about as large as the narrow loophole of one of the many watch-towers built on the headlands of the coast; and through this any wind that sweeps across the sea might whistle at will. In a corner of this dreary abode, there is a hole in the rock, now worn smooth, probably by the monks and hermits of after-times, and here, as tradition says, did Helier stretch his limbs during the few hours which he gave to sleep. For this dreary place he gave up his father's palace; and if any one is tempted to ask why he took all this trouble, I would bid him wait till the end of my story, and he will know. ("A Legend of S. Helier, Hermit in Jersey," pp. 23, 24.)

Among the miracles recorded of S. Helier in Jersey are the healing of a paralytic named Ascretillus, and of a lame woman; and the legend told that the mark of their footsteps was left on the rock. It is a curious coincidence, and at the same time an example of the confusion that is often found in legends of this class, that there existed till recently (that is, recently when F. Dalgairns wrote) on a rock on the beach near this place some singular marks, which tradition ascribed to the foot-prints of the B. Virgin, and from which the locality was called *Le Havre des Pas*. This rock, with the ruins of a chapel that had been built on the spot, was blown up in order to procure stone for the building of a fort.

S. Helier had been three years in his rocky hermitage when S. Marculfus came to visit him, and such had been the effect of the austerities his young disciple had gone through, that at first he could not recognize him. Whilst S. Marculfus remained on the island, it was menaced by a fleet of Saxon pirates, stated, however, in one account, to have come from the Orkneys. The few and peaceful islanders, when their well-known and dreaded foes were in sight, had recourse to S. Marculfus, whose prayers and encouragement enabled them to offer an unexpected resistance. Three days after, S. Marculfus returned to the mainland, and S. Helier remained as before twelve years longer. At the end of that time, he was martyred by a band of Saxon or Vandal pirates, who made a descent on the island; and his body was found lying decapitated on the sand, by a religious who had been assigned as his spiritual guide (called in the Acts *pædagogus*) by S. Marculfus, and who dwelt on the shore opposite his hermitage. He conveyed it to some place on the continental coast, whither is uncertain; but the Abbey of Beaubec, in Normandy, possessed some of his relics. The whole record is characterized by circumstances of marvel, which, however vague or unreliable, would alone prove, by their having circulated in these early ages, that S. Helier must have been a great servant of God. Some historian of the Channel Islands, and we hope a Catholic, will yet have to investigate and disentangle the copious, but wild and confused legends of the saints, to whom the islands were indebted for Christianity. The incredulous and rather desultory sketch given by Dr. Latham may stimulate but certainly not satisfy curiosity on a most interesting subject, which is practically unworked. We can but indicate its importance; yet would remark that the early history of Christianity in the Channel Islands ought especially to attract the small but increasing band of Celtic scholars among us. The remaining great saints, by whom Guernsey and the other isles were converted, came indeed immediately from Brittany, but their origin was from the western Celtic regions. The founder of the great Abbey of Dol, S. Sampson, from whom a town in Guernsey takes its name, was born in Glamorganshire, was the disciple of the British saints, Iltutus and Dubrius, and afterwards made the voyage to Ireland to profit by the example and instructions of the saints who at that time made the Irish Church so illustrious throughout Christendom. When he passed into Brittany, he was accompanied by his kinsman, S. Maglorius, of whose missionary labours Jersey, where he founded an abbey of sixty monks, and probably also Guernsey, was the scene. On the general character of the

introduction of Christianity into the Channel Islands, Dr. Latham has the following very suggestive remarks, in which, however, we note the attempt to depreciate the traditional character of the early Irish Church, and, on the other hand, to elevate it by an imagined contrast with political views on the part of the Mother and Mistress of all Churches: such, at least, seems the motive of one sentence:—

It was in the main Irish; in saying which it may be well to add that this assertion is not made by an Irishman. When all that can be said or done in the way of deduction from the extravagant claims of the over-patriotic Irish antiquaries of both the last century and the present has been said and done—when the claims for the green land of Erin having been an isle of saints and a sanctuary for simplicity, orthodoxy, and learning, have been set aside, there still remains the undoubted fact that, for the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, the Irish Church was not only a Christian but a missionary one; indeed, with the exception of the two great organized capitals—Rome and Constantinople, it was more so than any other. And it was a missionary Church in the best sense—simple, active, and single-minded; with no political ends to subserve, and with nothing but a purely apostolic mission to fulfil. The evidence of this, not resting upon the lives of its saints (though these are, on the whole, more truthful than any others), lies in the earlier accounts of Anglo-Saxon Christianity, and in the numerous German and Italian monasteries which, as has been shown from the Irish MSS., they possess, were regulated after the Irish discipline, and inspected, if not superintended, from Ireland. These are simply historical facts. In a more special view of the matter, we find that it was with the populations of British and German origin that the Irish missionaries most interested themselves; so that Brittany is, of all others, the country in which they are most to be expected. The name, then, of the chief Breton saint, Maglorius, is Irish; and from him comes the name of St. Malo. That the islands were just the spots which such missionaries would choose we infer from their establishments in the western islands of Scotland, especially Hi, Iona, or Icolmkill. Their discipline was essentially anchoritic and recluse; and the lone island, with a rude and simple congregation, was what they best loved. (Ansted and Latham, "*The Channel Islands*," pp. 325, 326.)

The later medieval history of Guernsey and its sister-islands offers comparatively little of interest. It is a noteworthy but little-noticed fact, that it was owing to the miserable King John that they did not finally follow the fortunes of the Duchy of Normandy. He saved them to the crown of England and gave them a constitution. Yet, ecclesiastically, they still remained under the jurisdiction of the see of Coutances until the Reformation, though by a thread of obedience which, it is perhaps surprising, lasted through so many centuries under such kings. Henry V., for example, banished Norman ecclesiastics out of the island; their influence would probably be

exercised in a way to cause the same jealousy which was felt on the part of England against Normandy in earlier times. In the long conflict between France and England, however, the Channel Islands must have generally afforded one of the retreats least liable to disturbance which were to be found in Europe, little as one might have expected it from their situation. They escaped not—as nothing escaped—the watchful eye of the Holy See; and, in 1380, Pope Pius IV. issued a bull excommunicating all who disturbed or molested the inhabitants of the Channel Islands. We have seen, at a later period, a similarly benign exercise of Papal authority in favour of the island of Man. This neutrality was respected and enforced by successive sovereigns both of France and England, and confirmed in particular by Henry VI. In the reign of Edward III., indeed, a breath of war brings Guernsey into the picturesque pages of Froissart. In the course of the quarrel between the French and English crowns about the rival claims of Charles of Blois and John Earl of Montfort to the Duchy of Brittany, a naval action of some magnitude took place off Guernsey in 1343. Names of attractive splendour occur in it. The Spanish fleet (for it was then acting for France), with 3,000 Genoese on board, was commanded by the famous admiral Don Louis de España, aided by Carlo Grimaldi and Odoardo Doria, and by the Countess of Montfort herself, who fought like another Artemisia; and the English leader was Robert of Artois, Earl of Richmond. The long-bow of the English and the cross-bow of the Genoese were well matched; but the English were harassed by the enemy from their loftily-built Spanish ships throwing down great bars of iron among them. A terrific storm put an end to the conflict, which carries with it no historical consequences. Scarcely of greater importance, even to Guernsey, was a descent made on the island in the same reign by a Welsh chieftain, Ivan or Evan, who had betaken himself to the service of the King of France, and was sent by him with ships and an armed force to attack Guernsey. He fought a battle with the governor, Edmund Ross, whose small army was but 800 men, and forced him to fly to Castle Cornet, which he unsuccessfully besieged for some time, till called away by the King of France, whom the defeat and capture of the Earl of Pembroke and Sir Guiscard d'Angle before La Rochelle gave better hopes of contending with the English in Poitou.

After this, little of interest to the general historian occurs in connection with the Channel Islands till we arrive at Stuart times. The well-known tale about the alleged burning of the child of Perrotine Massey in the Marian epoch occupies a

page or two of Dr. Latham's sketch. We do not propose to discuss it, beyond remarking that his bias is quite plain, in spite of his habit of balancing probabilities, where he at once sets aside Parsons' account, as coming from an apostate (meaning a convert) and a Jesuit, and an apostate "because he had been detected in dishonesty." Words like these show a prejudice with which reasoning can hardly contend.

The part taken by Guernsey and Jersey respectively in the civil wars had been prepared long before by the differences in their social and religious conditions. Guernsey, on the whole, was Presbyterian, Jersey, episcopal and royalist, the inhabitants of the former being more addicted to commerce, those of the latter to agriculture, for traffic generally favours the spirit of change, and tillage the conservative principle. The Reformation, in its early operation on the two islands, had been coloured accordingly; a consistory of ministers and lay elders having been introduced in Elizabeth's reign, which, in that of her successor, was abolished in Jersey, but retained in Guernsey. The influence of particular families also favoured the different lines which the insular politics respectively took; those of De Beauvoir, Carey, and De Havilland being most prominent in Guernsey, and that of De Carteret in Jersey. Members of the three first-named families figure in a romantic adventure which took place in Castle Cornet in 1642. There had been an attempt on the part of Sir George Carteret, of Jersey, in concert with Sir P. Osborne, the Governor of Guernsey, to make a move on the royalist side, which was counteracted by the partisans of the Parliament; and subsequently the Parliament constituted a provisional government of the island, and gave them orders to arrest their governor, seize Castle Cornet and all ships employed for its relief, and administer the armed force of the island on behalf of the Parliament. Osborne, however, held his fortress against them, and threatened the town with his cannon. Later, by a trick of a parliamentarian naval captain named Bowden, who had deserted his party, the three leaders of the Guernsey parliamentary faction, Peter de Beauvoir, James de Havilland, and Peter Carey, were enticed on board his ship, taken to Castle Cornet, and there imprisoned. The accommodation of state prisoners in that island-stronghold was anything but comfortable. It happens that curious particulars of this are extant, referring to different times of the same epoch. Readers of Clarendon are familiar with the fact that it was thither that Henry Burton, the companion of Prynne and Bastwick, was banished, after exposure in the pillory and amputation of

his ears. M. Métivier furnishes on this subject the following details from family records of his own :—

In the journal of our maternal ancestor, John de la Marche, minister of S. Peter's Port, and subsequently of S. Andrew's, it is said that Henry Burton, Doctor of Divinity, was "buried alive" in the year 1637, in the same chamber in Castle Cornet where De la Marche had himself been incarcerated four years previously. Neither sun nor moon was seen in it on any day of the year, and the partition-wall of this chamber was of *torcas*, a compost of straw and mud. The word is analogous to the Spanish *torca*, a bunch or bundle of straw, Neo-lat. *torcia*, *torsia*, Orléanois, *turcie*. (Métivier, "Dictionnaire Franco-Normand," art. *Torcas*, from which we translate.)

It does not, however, appear that the Guernsey commissioners were lodged in poor Burton's cell, and they were allowed wine and beer, though they had to complain of bad water, and short commons in fresh meat; besides, as it is said, the imminent prospect of being hanged. This they avoided by their own ingenuity and daring. They had been removed from a lower room, where some cotton was stored, into an upper one. They cut through the flooring of the latter, got at the cotton, of which they made ropes, let themselves down the wall, and, though fired at, succeeded in making their escape to Guernsey.

The next event of importance in the insular annals is the arrival of the Prince of Wales, afterwards Charles II., in Jersey, in April, 1646. He had no sooner got there with a train of three hundred followers, on board three ships, than most anxious pains were taken, though unsuccessfully, by watching every outlet on the Jersey coasts, to prevent the news reaching Guernsey. The Prince resided at Elizabeth Castle, and won that sort of popularity which his easy, gracious manners always enabled him to earn very cheaply. He gratified the public curiosity by dining in public; he held levees and receptions; he made the governor, Sir George Carteret, knight and baronet, and conciliated the people in a more substantial way, by ordering restitution of various articles of property, particularly jewellery, which had been declared forfeit to the Crown during the late troubles. The islanders were prepared to like him, and there was no lack of enthusiastic loyalty on the part of Jersey. The Prince's stay, however, in Jersey was not very protracted. Queen Henrietta Maria was bent on his removing into France, contrary to the judgment of the best adviser in his suite, the future Clarendon, whose residence in the island is also one of the associations which give its history an interest at the period before us. A

fresh complication was introduced into the question by the arrival of the versatile and sanguine Digby, who arrived from Ireland with three hundred soldiers, and was at first eager to induce the Prince to take refuge in that country instead of France. He went to France to induce Cardinal Mazarin to support this plan, leaving his ships, officers, and soldiers in Jersey, says Clarendon, "without one penny of money to subsist on in his absence." The politic cardinal knew Lord Digby well, and by flattering his importance with communications about the intentions of France with reference to the royal interest both in England and Ireland, brought him round to favour the Prince's removal into France. The Prince himself, with his characteristic wilfulness, decided on this step, though all the members of his council but one, Lord Colepepper, opposed it. He was detained some days by contrary winds, during which the little court of Elizabeth Castle was troubled by its own storms in this conflict of opinion. A scrap from a letter of Hyde's at this period, gives a hint which Scott could have worked up into a striking and amusing scene :—

The Lords Capell and Hopton, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, went once a day from the town to kiss his hands, after they had first taken their leave of him, and stayed very little time, there growing every day a visible strangeness between them and the rest, insomuch that they had little speech together, and the last day none ; the other lords sitting upon the bowling-green with the prince, who quickly left them, and they returned. (Quoted by Dr. Latham, "*Channel Islands*," p. 384.)

When incidents are somewhat scanty, one is tempted to make the most of any that occur. Let us add one, of no importance except that it is indirectly connected with this sojourn of the Stuart exiles in Jersey. That brave and frank cavalier Sir Harry Killigrew, had done good service in the gallant defence of Pendennis Castle in Cornwall, on the surrender of which he resolved to join his friends, Hyde and the rest, in Jersey, and had written to the former to send a boat to fetch him thither from St. Malo. Just upon sending this letter, an accident had occurred he thought of little consequence. A carbine he was discharging burst, and a splinter wounded his forehead, in spite of which he proceeded to St. Malo, but the injury was then found to be a serious one, and he died next day, desiring his dead body might be sent to Jersey. It was accordingly conveyed thither by the ship which Hyde had despatched, and on its arrival, he and his two faithful companions in exile, Capel and Hopton, with Sir George Carteret, went down to the harbour in all haste to welcome their friend, but instead found his body in the coffin, which was honourably buried in Jersey as he had wished.

The royalist cause was maintained in Jersey, and at Castle Cornet, in Guernsey, for several years after the period we have just noticed, till in both islands it yielded soon after the great defeat of Worcester in 1651. Admiral Blake was the too powerful adversary to whom Jersey succumbed. A four hours' battle was fought between his fleet and the garrison and island militia, after which he distressed his enemy by simultaneous attacks on St. Ouen's Bay, St. Aubin's Bay, St. Clement, and Granville. A night attack on St. Ouen's Bay followed, which was resisted with great bravery by Sir George Carteret, in spite of which Blake effected a landing, and the fortresses were not able to hold out many days. Fort St. Aubin, Mont Orgueil, and Elizabeth Castle successively yielded, the last, however, after a gallant resistance, which began to fail in consequence of a terrible explosion caused by a bomb which fell into a powder magazine, on the site of the old church of St. Helier. Charles II., then in Paris, sanctioned Carteret's making the best conditions he could, and the garrison were admitted to a capitulation of the most honourable kind, marching out with colours flying and drums beating, all being allowed to retain their swords, and the officers also their horses, cuirasses, and pistols. Castle Cornet, in Guernsey, capitulated on the same consolatory conditions. Both islands might no doubt have been saved from the Parliament had the king been willing to make France a depositary of them. "But the king," says Clarendon, "was so strict and punctual in his care of the interest of England, when he seemed to be abandoned by it, that he chose rather to suffer those places of great importance to fall into Cromwell's power, than to deposit them, upon any conditions, into French hands; which, he knew, would never restore them to their just owner, what obligations soever they entered into." (Clarendon, "*Hist. Reb.*," vi. p. 608.)

An address presented from the island of Guernsey to Oliver Cromwell subsequently to these events gives a vivid idea of its state during the time when Castle Cornet was being held for the king, and of its condition when the struggle was over. We borrow the following extract from Dr. Latham, who quotes the document at considerable length:—

The inhabitants, during the heat and danger of war, were in continual fears, services, and watchings, commonly twice a week, sometimes thrice; they had frequent alarms from Jersey, from Castle Cornet, from Normandy, from Brittany, and from the king's ships; they were always in arms, as in a garrison, or frontier-place remote from England; they constructed fortifications and some other works for their own defence, and were at their own charges for reducing and keeping Sark. They have paid for the maintenance

of frigates to prevent relief being given to the Castle, for beds, candles, fire for the soldiers, and divers other disbursements, amounting to above thirty thousand pounds. But what grieved the island most, being an evil undeserved, was the filling it with soldiers, though for seven years before, by the mercy of God, and the faithful endeavours of some active inhabitants, they had preserved themselves and the island in obedience to Parliament; and when the king was put to death, and his party and interests were brought low in England, there was no reason to fear for the inhabitants, who were then kept under like slaves, affronted, threatened, beaten; their orchards were robbed, their trees cut down, and their sheep stolen. The Parliament promised that the soldiers should be no charge to the inhabitants. Yet they took no notice that the island was almost undone, and could not bear the burden. (Latham, p. 388, 389.)

They especially besought Parliament to relieve them of a tax called *champart*, which was a payment of every twelfth sheaf of corn. It appears that the population of the island was 8,000, of whom only two or three had £200 a year, and fewer than ten £100; moreover, that two-thirds of the land was out of cultivation. Of the whole population, about 6,000 earned their living by making worsted stockings and other woollen articles.

Notwithstanding the more than proclivity which Guernsey had shown towards the Parliament, the islanders, upon the accession of Charles II., in 1660, made a very humble and penitential address to the Crown through their bailiff, Mr. Amias Andros, of Saumarez, and Nathaniel Darell. A full pardon was in consequence granted, from which honourable exceptions were made in favour of certain individuals as having continued inviolably faithful to his Majesty, and therefore having no need to be included in the pardon. These were Sir Henry Devic, Bart., Mr. Amias Andros above-mentioned, his son, Edward Andros, and brother, Charles Andros, and Nathaniel Darell. It is still remembered in the island that one of the Andros family was honoured with the office of cup-bearer to Charles II.

The history of the islands from the Restoration down to the present date is marked by certain leading facts, pervading long periods of time, and carrying with them important social effects, but presenting little that is picturesque and striking. They went with England, as might be expected, in the deposition of James II. The reign of William III. caused in Guernsey and Jersey a by no means glorious revolution, for he abolished the privilege of neutrality they had enjoyed from the reign of Pope Pius IV. downwards. The consequence of this was that smuggling and privateering became favourite pursuits of the islanders, and from the latter very unsatisfac-

tory source, during the great French war, much of the wealth of new families is said to have been derived. It was, however, only after England was a party to that war that the islanders took to privateering. At the commencement of the struggle between Prussia and Austria, the intention was formally disavowed by a circular to the merchants of the chief French ports. Dr. Latham supplies the curious fact that this circular, which was signed on the part of the islands by a Dobree, was also acknowledged on the part of France by a Dobree, showing how names are still found common both to insular and continental Normandy. Throughout the long wars of the last and present centuries the islands were sufficiently protected against hostile attempts, and only two of consequence appear to be on record, the last of which was in 1781, conducted by a Baron de Rullecourt, who surprised St. Helier's, seized the governor, and forced him to sign a capitulation of Elizabeth Castle, which, however, was defeated by the bravery of Major Pierson, the officer in command of the English troops. There was a combat in the market-place, in which the unchivalrous French invader was killed, and his force compelled to surrender.

We proceed to notice the most interesting features of the civil constitution of the islands, remarking, as we write these lines, that the subject seems to be attracting attention at this very moment, a detailed list of the privileges enjoyed by the inhabitants of the Channel Islands having been asked for in the House of Commons on May 31. Jersey and Guernsey are each, it is scarcely necessary to say, under a lieutenant-governor appointed by the Crown, always a general officer. With Guernsey go Alderney, Sark, Herm, and Jethou. Alderney formerly had hereditary governors, of the family of Le Mesurier; and Sark is still the property of a seigneur, or feudal lord, who appoints a seneschal, with jurisdiction in small offences. It was held by the Vernon family in Elizabeth's time, then for a very long period by the Le Pelleys, the last of whom, by the bye, was unhappily drowned within a very short distance of Creux harbour, he having persisted in an attempt to cross to Guernsey in dangerous weather in spite of the remonstrances and entreaties of all the friends who surrounded him. From the family of Le Pelley, the seigneurship of Sark passed to that of Collings. In the principal islands justice is administered by a magistrate called the Bailiff; and each has an attorney-general, styled the Procureur de la Reine. The Bailiff presides in the Royal Court, consisting of twelve jurats, elected for life; in Alderney he is represented by a judge, with a court of six jurats. The Bailiff, though

an officer of such importance, need not necessarily have had a legal education. The magistrate corresponding to High Sheriff is called in Jersey the Viscount, in Guernsey the *Prévôt*. Guernsey has a kind of parliament called the States of Deliberation, but between this body and the ratepayers, or *chefs de familles*, intervenes another assembly called the Elective States. This latter consists of the Bailiff, twelve jurats, rectors (the incumbents of the ten Protestant parishes, appointed by the Crown), the Queen's Procureur, the douzaniers and constables, making up altogether two hundred and twenty-two members. The douzaniers are like the churchwardens, having control over parochial expenditure, and are elected by the ratepayers. The Elective States appear to have nothing to do but to elect the jurats and the sheriff, but as the jurats are really the bench of judges, and also have seats in the deliberative assembly, this alone is an important function. The States of Deliberation are composed of the same officers as those already mentioned in the Elective States, but the douzaniers and constables are replaced by deputies elected from the various parishes. The number of members is altogether thirty-seven. The Bailiff nominally proposes measures, but in most cases they originate with committees, officials, or even private individuals, and he must bring forward any measure if required by a certain number of members to do so. The States have the important attribute of considering any question affecting the interests of the islands which has to come before government, and if an Act of Parliament has to be opposed, it is they who communicate with the Privy Council. The Bailiff presides, and the Governor may sit and speak if he thinks proper. All bills for discussion are first submitted to the Royal Court, and may be discussed by the douzaniers, who thus influence their deputies. The meetings of the States are public. As in the Imperial Parliament, there is a good deal of legislation by committees, their business chiefly concerning public works, harbours, roads, streets, parochial education, and the like. In Jersey the governor has a veto on all questions discussed. His consent is also necessary for convening the States, though he must convene them if required to do so by the bailiff and jurats. In Guernsey the Royal Court has also very considerable legislative power. It not only prepares bills for the approval of the States, but it may issue *ordonnances* entirely *proprio motu*, but these *ordonnances*, if intended to be permanent, must be approved by the States. They range over various matters—harbours, rights to seaweed, mode of levying taxes, discipline of militia, &c. It will thus appear that there is something in

the powers of the Royal Court of Guernsey analogous to the old French *parlements*. The overlapping of the judicial and legislative functions seems to belong to the earlier stages of the development of society, though they can never be wholly dissevered.

The laws and customs with regard to landed property in the islands are somewhat peculiar. Much of it is subject to an annual payment called "rents," strictly of corn, but paid in money, and varying with the price of that article on a scale settled by the States. These payments have arisen from part of the purchase-money being left unpaid, the interest of which they represent, but are bought and sold like other property. Some of the rents are payable in fowls, similarly valued. The law of inheritance is very reasonable. The eldest son gets the family-house, with a small portion of land, two acres in Jersey, but only one-sixth of an acre in Guernsey, and the rest is divided between the sons and daughters, two-thirds to the former, and one-third to the latter. Property sold remains liable to the debts of the vendor charged on it, so that the purchaser may find himself in an awkward position, if its state has not been carefully seen to. Again, the lord of the manor can claim land that has been sold, on payment of the purchase-money. Whether, practically, inconvenience arises from these embarrassing privileges, we cannot say. Legally, in England, the property of a tenant, we believe, may be seized for the debts of the landlord, but how often, in practice, has such a right been carried into effect?

One particular connected with Channel Islands' jurisprudence is not generally known, which is, that the training for it is not obtained in the Inns of Court, but in the legal schools of Normandy and Brittany, as Caen or Rennes. Though English law is so largely traceable to Norman origin, and though, on the other hand, the French Revolution swept away so much of the old system, yet the Code Napoléon, it seems, has left the modern French law still so like the old, that the Guernsey lawyers, practising on the basis of the *Coustumier* of old Normandy, still find that they must go to France to be trained for their work. No doubt this custom is of old date, and continental influences must all along have not been without their effect on the insular legislation. Another reason is, that the pleadings are, or may be, carried on in the French language. Notwithstanding this important surviving connection of the Channel Islands with France, we believe we are correct in asserting that there is no political sympathy whatever for France in the Channel Islands. The people cling to England, yet not because they are English, but because they have a

common sovereign. The upper classes, indeed, are English in language and habits—we speak, of course, of those really native to the islands—English in their pursuits and ambitions, but with a good deal of the French type of character, more, however, that of old France than of the France of to-day; and in Guernsey, as in French Canada, is still preserved a nationality which, on the European Continent, has been unhappily displaced by the development and predominance of elements of a description none lament more than good French people themselves. On this head of our inquiry we could speak more largely, but, after all, it is only individual impressions that we could give, however individually decided, and travellers must make and use opportunities for drawing their own conclusions. It is well known that society in the island is, or perhaps we ought to say, for many years was, divided into two sets, called respectively the Sixties and the Forties, the former composed of the old families and those allied to them, the latter of families of newly-acquired wealth and position. The distinction was almost as rigidly kept up as that between the *sangre azul* in Spain, and the *nuevos Cristianos*. The two sets did not intermarry, or if they did, the descendants took the lower level, as in old Rome, when patrician blood was contaminated by alliance with plebeian. They did not meet in society, and saluted not in the *carrefour* as equals. All this was deprecated by strangers, but then the Sixties alleged that the Forties owed their wealth to privateering and to trade, and that it was too much to expect that this could be condoned by those whose shields bore no such blot. Time, however, does what neither laws nor governors can do, and a generation has seen the distinction greatly obliterated. People, indeed, say the order is reversed, that the social pyramid of the island is inverted, and that the Forties stand where the Sixties did. "The streams of the sacred rivers run back to their sources, and justice and everything is turned upside down." To speak seriously, that has happened in Guernsey which has happened in many an English provincial capital which any reader who knows English society could name; only in Guernsey, the distinction had been more marked, because the sets had definite names, so that the change must be more deeply felt. Something of the same kind exists, or existed in Jersey, under the name of the factions of the Laurel and the Rose; how far it still obtains, we are unable to say.

We may remark, on the whole, that the old society of Guernsey had a real claim to respect, independently of high-sounding Norman names. Few communities have contributed more, in proportion, to the riches of the empire than they, and

names like De Saumarez, Le Marchant, Brock, and others of their stamp, have merited very honourable remembrance in the list of British officers of note and importance. Island birth seems to favour such excellence, because, on the one hand, it affords small scope at home, and drives the youths out to seek their fortunes, and on the other, the motive is intensified by the wish to return to the old hearths in their sea-girt homes with a title, or a medal, or a sword, to make those they love proud of them.

It has been remarked that if any individual whatever could give a faithful account of his own biography the work could not fail to be of general interest, and it would be still more true to say that a really complete history of any place or province must interest all. For the life of a nation is a most complex thing, not to be understood without understanding the manifold influences which, coming, many of them, from very remote and hidden quarters, make up the organism of the whole. No historian is qualified to do justice to England without a deep acquaintance with the county-histories, and we have said enough to show that the Channel Islands present even a more powerful admixture in the tissue than many important counties have done. We can scarcely say that the work of recording this has yet been accomplished. Messrs. Ansted and Latham's splendid volume, whilst Paul Naftel's pencil makes it unrivalled in its class as regards artistic illustration, is admirably drawn up as a physical account of the islands, and very fairly as regards civil history; indeed, we have been far too much indebted to the work in the foregoing pages to undervalue it. But future investigators may add to their researches materials of which a good supply may be found for a *libro d'oro* of the families of this insular Normandy, and sketches of the careers of those who have adorned their island by success in literature, in arts, and arms. If such do not stand in the very first rank of renown, we are much mistaken if any space equally narrow has contributed examples of cultivation and practical service more numerous or more deserving remembrance.

ART. II.—HERGENRÖTHER ON CHURCH AND STATE.

Catholic Church and Christian State. A series of Essays on the Relation of the Church to the Civil Power. Translated from the German of Dr. JOSEPH HERGENRÖTHER. Two vols. 8vo. London : Burns & Oates, 1876.

IN somewhat tardy fulfilment of a promise made in our number for April, 1876, we intend now to give our readers a more complete idea of the great work named at the head of this article. It is too much the fashion at present to call every work *great* which is written on the right side, in a loyal spirit, and with evidence of a certain amount of reading and reflection. Such slovenly or partial criticism of course creates a low standard, and authors of inferior merit are classed with those who may justly claim to rank far above them. We make this remark because we wish our readers to understand that we are speaking advisedly, and with a sense of responsibility when we put in this higher rank the work which we are about to review. Many of the subjects of which it treats have been handled separately, with more completeness and effect by other authors. But we say, without hesitation, that there is no work, in the whole range of ecclesiastical literature, so well adapted to the general reader, and yet at the same time so comprehensive, so solid, and so accurate. It treats of all the relations of Church and State ; of the principles on which they are founded, and of the historical facts in which they are exhibited. The most striking feature of the work is, perhaps, the amount of positive information which it contains. The number of subjects treated, of authors quoted and referred to is overwhelming. It is almost a library in itself. The whole ground is covered. The principles of the Church's action are fully exhibited ; very many special points are fully illustrated ; and by remarks, suggestions, and references, the author gives his readers the means of finding an answer to almost every question connected, even remotely, with his subject. And if the great number of facts and arguments make some parts of the work difficult to follow and realize in a cursory reading, this will be no drawback to the thoughtful student.

The keynote of the work is the defence of the Vatican decrees, and, especially, the dogma of Papal Infallibility, against the attacks of such men as Schulte, Huber, Döllinger, Friedrich, and others, belonging chiefly to the

German Alt-Catholic party. The author has followed the lines laid down by these men, and this explains the general shape of the work, and accounts for what we must consider a certain defect of logical order and method. The divisions seem to be made sometimes at haphazard; subjects are not always treated according to their intrinsic importance, but according to the importance given them by objectors; some parts read like digressions; one or two important subjects are omitted, because the author has elsewhere treated them. Of course we do not mean to question an author's right to treat his matter in the way he may prefer; we only regret that a work of such value, so certain to *live*, and to become a standard authority, should allow its form to be determined by accidental and ephemeral considerations. As our other objections against the work refer also chiefly to its form, we take this opportunity of mentioning them. The first is a certain want of unity in the general structure. The materials are not worked up into an organic whole. Too much is left to the mechanical means of detached paragraphs; a method which, like the framing of a picture, is useful to fix our attention on a special object, but certainly disturbs our view of its connection with the objects which surround it. The other fault that we have to find with the work is that it is not sufficiently *impressive*. There is a want of grouping in the minute details, a lack, here and there, of the final *clenching* to an important argument, a want of consideration of the effect likely to be produced upon the mind of an ignorant or prejudiced reader. But, after all, these defects do not affect the substance of the work, and weigh lightly indeed against the solid learning, the sound argument, and the general clearness and propriety of exposition which distinguish it.

The English translator and editor has done his work well. The translation is excellent in its three requirements of fidelity, correctness, and grace. Our extracts will sufficiently prove this. We think the translator might well have taken somewhat greater liberty with the notes, and compressed the whole into one volume. We must regret that the high price should put so useful a book beyond the reach of many. There are a few inaccuracies of grammar and expression, and once or twice the German original is improperly rendered. The Latin notes require a more careful revision. The text of the translation is from the author's second and popular edition, while the notes are supplied from the greater edition, the whole being thus happily adapted to the general and to the studious reader.

The work consists of eighteen essays, most of which are

divided into two or three parts, the parts being subdivided into numbered sections. Each essay treats separately of some great principle or fact belonging to the main subject. The order of the essays does not seem to be considered by the author of any great importance, as it is different in the different editions. The translator has also made a slight change here. But to us the author's idea seems to be nearly this. The first five essays treat of what we may call the *urgent* religious questions of the day,—civil allegiance,* the infallibility and authority of the Pope, the authority of the Vatican Council, and the Syllabus. The seven following essays have a closer sequence. After a splendid essay on the "Fundamental Principles of the Middle Ages," the chief historical difficulties of that period are separately treated. The thirteenth essay, on "The two Powers," is to our mind the most important of all, and we think that those who really wish to master the work would do well to begin with this essay. At the same time it is chiefly with regard to that part of this essay which treats of the indirect power that we shall have to take exception to some of our author's statements. Closely connected with the thirteenth are the two following essays, on civil and on ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The three last essays treat of various general objections against the doctrines and practice of the Church; such as the Inquisition, liberty of conscience, and the punishment of heresy.

In such an immense range and variety of subjects it is not easy to present the reader with a clear and accurate idea of the work. If we try to reduce the immense collection of facts and principles to strict systematic form, we shall give a very vague idea of the method and style of the book, and if we follow the author's method too closely, we run the risk of making our paper a mere summary and tedious repetition. Perhaps the following plan will best hit the mean. We will divide our author's essays according to their subjects into three groups. In the first we will place those which treat the general principles, theoretical and actual, of the relations between Church and State; in the second, those which treat special points of history; in the third, those which treat special points of doctrine. In treating the first group we will throw the author's teaching into our own form; as regards the

* We think the translator would have done well to retain the author's own title to the essay on this subject—"The danger to the State of the Roman See, and of its doctrines." The English title leads us to expect a treatise on the general subject; the German expresses more correctly, though less neatly, the exact subject of the essay.

second and the third, we will follow more closely the author's treatment.

I. In pursuance of this design we come first to speak of the general doctrine on Church and State, treated by our author in Essays I. VI. XIII. XIV. XV. and in part of Essay V. This we will consider according to the three great objections which are made against it. We will therefore, in the first place, exhibit and defend the general theory of her claims; then we will defend her from the charge of usurpation which is made against her application of these principles in the Middle Ages; and finally we will rebut the favourite accusation of modern adversaries, that because in these days, her authority is not recognized by the State, she sets herself in irreconcilable opposition to the State.

The Church is a society instituted by God to secure the eternal interests of men. She is, therefore, the depositary, guardian, and interpreter of God's truth and of God's law. To this description of the Church's nature and office no exception can be taken by men who believe, in any true sense, in the Catholic Church. The Church is then the supreme society (*societas suprema*); that is to say, her claims take rank before the claims of all other societies. The proof is simple: as the individual man must put the interests of his eternal life before all merely temporal interests, so a society duly appointed primarily to regulate the eternal interests of men, stands above a society appointed primarily to regulate their temporal interests (H., XIII. Pt. 1). The Church, again, is a perfect society (*societas perfecta*); that is to say, she is complete in herself, and in independent possession of that legislative, judicial, and coercive authority which is included in the very idea of a perfect society (H., V. Pt. 2, §§ 1-7, and especially XVII. p. 374). In what sense could the Church be called the supreme guardian of God's law, if she herself were under the control of another society, and allowed to speak and act only under the direction of a higher power? The Church then is supreme and perfect. She is supreme because the end of her institution is supreme, and perfect because she is supreme.

But the authority of the Church, though supreme and perfectly independent, is not universal. The end of a society, while it determines its nature and rank, also limits its competence. The sphere of the Church is the spiritual order, and her end the eternal interests of man. There co-exists with the Church another society, the State, instituted by God to secure man's temporal well-being. This society has a distinct sphere of action, in which it is quite independent. It

is a perfect society, having its own rights and its own duties. To put the case practically, an individual, member of both societies, is equally bound to obey the laws of each, and finds his duties as a citizen in no way hampered by his duties to the Church. He owes obedience to each in the sphere of each. As S. Thomas says (quoted by Herg., I. p. 15, note 1), "the secular power is under the spiritual power in so far as it is placed under it by God, that is to say, in those things which belong to the salvation of souls, and therefore in these we must obey the spiritual rather than the temporal. But in those things which belong to the civil sphere he must obey the temporal rather than the spiritual power, according to that—*Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.*" The State cannot define a dogma, or institute a new ceremony; but so neither has the Church received any power from God to raise a new tax, to introduce conscription, or in any way to interfere with the merely temporal polity of the State.

We cannot turn over even the first pages of our author without finding clear proof that the Church in modern days fully recognizes the independence of the State. As to earlier times it will be enough to quote the doctrine of the Popes who are most earnestly accused of denying it. Nothing, for instance, could be clearer than the words of Nicholas I., whom Neander considers the founder of the Papal supremacy. "Acknowledge that the administrator of temporal things ought as little to interfere with spiritual matters as the clergy, the soldiers of God, ought to entangle themselves with secular concerns. Before Christ's coming, the offices of king and priest were sometimes typically united, as for instance in the case of Melchisedech; and the devil, imitating this in his members, caused the Pagan emperors to be considered also the high priests. But when the true King and Pontiff came . . . by peculiar duties and distinct dignities he so distinguished the two offices, that the Christian emperors should require the Pontiff for eternal life, and the Pontiffs, for mere temporal matters, should observe (*uterentur*) the laws of the emperor, taking care to keep the spiritual action apart from secular control (*carnalibus incurisibus*). (Letter to Emp. Mich., referred to by Herg., XIII. p. 186.)

So Gregory VIII. addresses Henry IV. of Germany as placed by God "*in summo rerum culmine*" (H., XIV. p. 237, note 4); and in his letter (Registrum, l. vii. ep. xxv.) to William the Conqueror clearly states the distinction in nature and duties of the two powers.

Innocent III. refused to decide on a certain case which had been brought before him, because "the King of France ac-

knowledges in temporal matters no superior" (H., XIII. p. 195). And elsewhere he clearly distinguishes between his own universal spiritual jurisdiction and limited temporal power (ib. p. 207, note 5). We intend later on to exhibit more fully this doctrine of Innocent. Similar is the doctrine of Boniface VIII.

The State then is, and is acknowledged by the Church to be, independent in its own sphere; but that sphere is itself subordinate to the sphere of the Church. The State is a perfect society, but it is not supreme. It must take, therefore, a subordinate part in the conduct of human life. It must give up its control over the action of its members, in so far as this action enters the sphere of religion and morality. And this brings us to the most important question concerning the relations of Church and State. Keeping strictly to what we have asserted, admitting that the Church has authority only in the spiritual sphere, insisting again on the Church's full recognition of the independence of the State, we still maintain that the Church has a real claim on the obedience of her members, even in matters which in some respects come also within the sphere of the State, in the case that the principles of religion and morality, of which she has been appointed supreme and sole guardian, are in question. We may deny the existence of such a guardian, but, this admitted, it is surely unreasonable to deny her competence in matters of her own jurisdiction, merely because these may happen to have relation to secular matters. We do not deny that this does give the Church a real, though indirect power, over temporals, but this is not because she claims a wider field of jurisdiction than belongs to her, but because the temporal sphere in which the State has power, has its roots in the spiritual sphere, where the Church alone has jurisdiction. The very duty of obedience to the State rests, like all other duties, upon the moral law. If the comparison is not trivial, we may say that while God has given to the State the surface of men's actions in civil matters, He has reserved to the Church, as representative of His Kingship, the *royalty* of them, and she has rights of property over *them* in so far as they come between her and the treasures which lie beneath them. Even candid Protestants admit this. The clear-sighted Leibnitz says: "I think we must recognize the power of the Church in temporal matters, on account of the indirect influence which temporal matters may have over the salvation of souls. The Church must determine also the case of conscience concerning the obedience due or not due to temporal sovereigns. I make an exception only with regard

to the power of rebellion, which the Church cannot and must not authorize. The Church can forbid her children to obey the magistrates in certain cases, and they must then obey the universal Church rather than their sovereign," &c. (Letter to Péliisson, quoted by H., I. p. 12, note 2).

That this, and this alone, is the principle on which the Church claims authority in temporals, we will now proceed to show. We are speaking, of course, of her own innate prerogative, and independently of any special rights which may at various times have been granted her. In the first part of Essay XIII. the author clearly exhibits this as the doctrine of the Popes and Fathers, but we will content ourselves on this point again with stating the doctrine of those Church rulers who are said to have held the most extreme views of the extent of their power. We intend to consider the principles of Gregory VII. more in detail in the second division of our article. It will be enough here to quote Neander: "Gregory decidedly avowed the principle that God had conferred on Peter and his successors not only the guidance of the whole Church in respect to spiritual affairs, but also a *moral* superintendence over all nations" (ed. Bohn, vol. vii. p. 118). Of Innocent III. the same author says: "Over bishops and monarchs, in affairs ecclesiastical and political, which latter he believed he could bring before his tribunal in so far as they should be decided *on religious or moral principles*, he asserted his supreme juridical authority with energy and firmness" (ib., p. 240). Innocent's doctrine is chiefly contained in the celebrated Decretal "*Novit*," of which we will here give the author's exposition (E. XIII. pt. 1, § 15).

Innocent declares that he has the honour and well-being of the King of France so much at heart, that he considers the exaltation of his kingdom as the exaltation of the Holy See, and that he was far from intending in any way to injure him; that, burdened already with duties beyond his strength, he had no thought of encroaching upon the jurisdiction of the king, and neither would the king desire to do anything to the prejudice of the Pope's jurisdiction; that he had merely made use of the spiritual jurisdiction possessed by the Church (Matt. xviii. 15-17); that when brotherly admonition and correction before witnesses were fruitless, the sinner was to be brought before the judgment-seat of the Church; . . . that the right of correction, even in the case of princes, had ever been inherent in the Church; that he had no intention of judging in a question of *fiefs*, but in a question of *sin*, to censure which was beyond doubt the duty of the Pope; that, moreover, this was a case of treaties of peace, confirmed by oath, and broken before the appointed time; and that it was the duty of the Church to take cognizance of oaths.

The principle of the Decretal is, that *directly* the Church has to pass judg-

ment as to the violation of the moral law, *indirectly* as to the temporal matters involved. The Pope was not directly concerned in the execution of the sentence of the French feudal court, nor in the sentence itself, but, grievous offences against the moral law fall under the judgment of the head of the Church. . . . This is a power given, not by men, but by God, the power of binding and loosing, given to S. Peter, and affecting all Christians without respect of persons.

We think we have now made good our statement that the Church only claims authority over temporal matters in so far as they become, so to speak, the subjects of the moral law. The doctrine is well summed up in the words of Cardinal Antonelli, cited by the author (XIII. p. 231) and by ourselves (April, 1876, p. 367). Before leaving this part of our subject, we must refer to a very incorrect expression of our author (I. p. 18), to the effect that the goodwill of the faithful is "the foundation of the doctrine of the indirect power of the Church over temporals." The foundation of the *doctrine* is what we have stated; the goodwill of the faithful is only a condition necessary for its application. He says better (VII. p. 375), "The Pope's power was not physical or material, but was a moral and spiritual power, relying on public opinion for its efficiency."

We come now to a closer consideration of the exact nature of this spiritual power over temporals. There are three systems among theologians on this point; they are treated by our author in the second part of Essay XIII., and are entitled respectively, the *direct*, the *indirect*, and the *directive* power.

The system of *direct* power makes the Church sole depositary of earthly power, and the civil authority a delegate of the Church. This theory we at once, with our author, put on one side as untenable. We can see no solid reason in its favour, and the Popes have consistently ignored it.

The system of *indirect* power we may define, nearly in our author's words, as a spiritual but real authority over temporal matters just so far as these are opposed to the supernatural end or necessary for its attainment (XIII. p. 209).

The system of *directive* power allows the Church simply to declare to her children their duty, to warn, admonish, and correct them. It will be seen that we have been defending the *indirect* power. The author, on the other hand, while anxious to reconcile it as far as possible with the *indirect*, supports the *directive* power. In his effort to do this we think he is inconsistent with his own doctrine, and does not treat fairly the indirect power. He might, perhaps, have avoided both these faults if he had kept the general subject of the *indirect* power distinct from that special department of it

which refers to the *deposing* power. With regard to the existence of the indirect power in general, it seems to us there cannot, in strict consistency of logic, be two opinions. It seems to us certain that with regard to *some* temporal matters the Church has a right not only to counsel and declare, but also to command or forbid. We do not intend here to prove the indirect power in detail, but we may say that it alone seems consistently to acknowledge the Church's power to bind and loose in matters of virtue and sin. It is implied in the action of popes and of other Church rulers who appeal, in the exercise of their authority over temporals, not only to the rights given them by the consent of men, but to the rights given them immediately by God. It is supported by the consent of the great body of theologians, and the author himself declares and proves that Bellarmine and the Jesuits of the 16th century, who formulated and thoroughly treated this question, only followed, in supporting the indirect power, the example of the earlier theologians. Surely, too, at least as much as this is implied in the expression of Döllinger, which the author seems to endorse, "When necessity calls for it, the Pope can do *everything*,—of course, with the reservation of observing God's laws" (I. p. 13). The author's doctrine, also, concerning the Church's power in the matter of oaths, of marriage, of unjust temporal laws, seems to imply the indirect power. But, whichever of the two theories we hold, it is of the last importance, in the interests of Church authority, that we should recognize the difference of principle between them. We must call attention to what we cannot consider other than a mistake of the author when he says, "In principle, the doctrines of the indirect and of the directive power do not in all points differ widely" (XIII. p. 230). It seems to us there is only one point to consider in the question of principle. In this they differ most widely, inasmuch as one affirms and the other denies the Church's power to command in certain cases. What the author means, or ought to mean, is that *in application* the two principles almost coincide. We say *almost*, because there are cases in which we might lawfully demur to the direction or advice, while we might not disobey the command of a lawful authority. Still, speaking generally, we agree that the wider principle is practically confined, by external conditions, to the same ground as the narrower. The questions to be decided would be so perplexing and so important, that the virtue of prudence, in the one theory, would lay our conscience under the same obligation as the virtue of obedience in the other. So, again, whether the Church possesses the right to command in these cases or not it is certain that she

is very frequently unable, through circumstances, to exercise it. The Church cannot assert a right against the laws of justice, of prudence, or of charity. Still, in these cases the difference of principle clearly appears. The one theory makes her the authoritative guide of conscience, the other only the adviser. One theory denies her right, the other only forbids her to use it. The general acknowledgment or concession by men is considered in the one theory as the very foundation of her right, in the other merely as a condition for its exercise.

We do not think it advisable to enter on the question of the deposing power within the brief space at our command. We must, however, remark that on this point again the author, while writing in a perfectly loyal spirit, does not do full justice to the *indirect power*. This remark applies especially to certain statements in p. 230, which are obscure, and, we must think, slightly inaccurate.

We have now exhibited the theoretical principles of the relation of Church and State, and while indicating what we consider the Church's full rights, we trust we have sufficiently shown that our duties to the Church do not conflict with our duties to the State; that there can be no other opposition between them than there may be between the law of God and the demands of the State. We now come to consider what we may call the Church's practical principles; that is to say, the modification of her theoretical principles, which acknowledgment of rights or denial of rights, which various and opposite circumstances, have made necessary. The history of the Church, from the time when she entered into intimate relations with the State, is divided by the Reformation into two most distinct periods—the Mediæval and the Modern. We will treat briefly of each of these.

The great charge made against the Mediæval Church is, as we have said, the charge of usurpation. It is a charge which can be maintained, even speciously only, by the unfair method, almost universal amongst the enemies of the Church, of judging her actions in the Middle Ages by the ideas and circumstances of modern times. To overthrow this accusation, we have to ask our readers simply to judge the Middle Ages by themselves. If we find that her rights were not only acknowledged, but extended, her help not only accepted, but demanded, her authority not only useful, but absolutely necessary, then is she completely cleared from this foul and impious charge. Our inquiry brings before us the great characteristics of the Middle Ages, which, while completely distinguishing them from modern times, furnish at the same time a complete justifica-

tion of the Church's action. These may conveniently be reduced to two.

The first is the great fact that the principles which we have been defending were fully and generously recognized in the Middle Ages as the fundamental principles of society and ethics. Essay VI. is one long proof of this. It was acknowledged that the Church was the sole guardian of religion and morality, entitled to direct her children in these matters with complete authority. Already, from the first submission of the Empire to the Church, as Neander admits, "the State itself declared the Church's principles to be those to which everything must be subordinated" (vol. iii. p. 185). So, from the Council of Chalcedon, the rule was admitted that whenever an imperial law contradicted the canon law it should be considered null. And even before this, as early as the year 445, the Emperor Valentinian III. declared resistance to the Roman bishop to be an offence against the Roman State. The power of the Church was more and more fully admitted during the times of anarchy which ensued between the overthrow and the revival of the Western Empire. Finally, the system of society which started from this latter event recognized Church authority, as represented not only by the Pope, but in a great degree also by the bishops, to be the very basis of the social order. The laws of Charlemagne sufficiently establish this. It is chiefly of this time we speak. We refer to anterior time chiefly to show that if circumstances developed them, the principles themselves were rooted in preceding ages. If the Church had only from Charlemagne's time begun the use of her power, she could not have fairly been accused of usurping, but when we find that Charlemagne solidified and strengthened a power already venerable, a power of which men had not yet tried the limits, we see that it was almost impossible for the Church to claim more than her children already credited her with.

Now, while the Church's power was thus considered to be almost boundless, the idea of the State, on the other hand, was proportionately contracted. Her province was *recognized* as subordinate. The theory of an irresponsible, absolute State was unknown. Princes and governments, as well as people, acknowledged themselves accountable to the Church in matters of virtue and sin. Thus Louis VII., referring to S. Peter's commission, "Feed my sheep," asks: "Are the kings of France, or any rulers, here excepted?" (Baronius, Ann., 1162, n. 10). Frederick II. admits that the temporal power is appointed for the support of the spiritual power (Herg., XIII. p. 180, note 5). Philip le Bel declares himself ready, "as

regards his soul and the spiritual order, to obey the counsels and commands of the Holy See, as he is bound to do."* Perhaps the most earnest defender of the Pope's power over princes is our own Henry VIII. The whole theory of secular government, indeed, was opposed to the idea of State absolutism. Princes were looked upon as parties to a contract. It was generally maintained that while civil authority in itself was from God, the people had the right to appoint the individual administrator. In many countries, as in Germany, and for many centuries in England, this right was exercised through actual election. So long as a prince, howsoever appointed, fulfilled the implied or expressed condition on which the sovereignty was intrusted to him, the people had no right to revoke their trust; but his duties were as determined as his rights, and their duty of obedience to him was not more absolute than his duty to them, to God, and to the Church. In opposing princes who violated the rights of their subjects the Church was really on the side of liberty and law. Such princes were the usurpers; and though it was sometimes possible for them by material force to oppose for a time the law of Christendom and the sense of the age, still in all the great struggles the Church came off victorious; thus proving how completely acknowledged by the consent of Christendom her principles were.

And here we must remark, in further defence of the Church, that her principles were not acknowledged merely in a general and vague manner, but certain special legal modes of action were at her disposal. The chief of these was her power to absolve from oaths, whether of allegiance or of any other kind, under certain conditions and limitations. A second was her power to inflict ecclesiastical censures, such as public penance and excommunication. The Church's right to apply these censures equally to princes and people was admitted, at least antecedently, by all, and the temporal as well as the spiritual consequences of them were admitted with equal completeness. We do not hesitate to say that the Church's admitted power of excommunication is alone enough to clear her from all the charges of usurpation made against her conduct to sovereigns in the Middle Ages.

But besides these supreme and exceptional rights there followed, from the general acceptance of her authority, very many other and special rights. Some of these rested on her essential authority, although, under different circumstances, she might not have been able to make them good. Such were

* Gieseler, K. G., vol. ii. pt. ii. edition Bonn, 1826, p. 175, note g.

the rights which she was gladly allowed to exercise of defending the weak, of protesting against injustice, of interfering between princes in the interests of peace and justice. Whole provinces of social life, now jealously subtracted from her control, were then, as a matter of course, submitted to it. The interests of the poor, of prisoners, of slaves, of all that needed relief and help, were under her maternal care. Education was her special province. The marriage contract, with its innumerable social ramifications, was under her immediate jurisdiction. In fact, it would be impossible to enumerate all the various channels in which Church influence and Church authority permeated the whole social system of the "Ages of Faith."

Other rights rested more directly on human institution, but still were founded on a sense of the Church's dignity and prerogatives. Thus from a sense of the sacredness of the sacerdotal character came the immunities of the clergy, and the spiritual courts. From a sense of their impartiality and with a reference to the very words of S. Paul (1 Cor. v.), they were called to administer even secular justice. From similar ideas and instincts came the rights of intercession, of sanctuary, and others of the same kind, all going back to the earliest days of recognition by the State.* To the Pope, as head of the Church, was attributed the right to appoint the supreme governor of the Christian commonwealth, and a proportionate power was given in the respective States to the spiritual authorities. Coronation, which was the formal recognition by the Church of the new temporal ruler, was generally considered an essential condition for the full enjoyment of sovereign power. The Pope, again, was the arbiter of Christendom. He admitted, with an authority fully acknowledged in those days, new members into the Christian confederation, and in another capacity, as head of the missionary office of the Church, was credited with a certain indirect authority even over the very lands of heathens. By a natural consequence also, and after the spirit of the ancient Roman law, islands, and places without regular and settled government, were considered to be in a special way under the Pope's jurisdiction.

Finally, many rights and privileges accrued to the Church from the free gift of the people or the sovereign. Such were the rights of suzerainty, the temporal possession and jurisdictions of the Popes and the higher clergy, and the special rights of the churches of various countries. These once

* The reader will find this matter clearly and fairly treated by Neander. vol. iii. sec. 2, pp. 184—207.

given became a sacred trust, not revocable at the mere caprice of the donors, given not to individuals, but to God in His representatives. And this is why the Church is so tenacious of her rights. She is not the real owner. She is God's trustee.

Such facts as these must all be borne in mind when estimating the Church's conduct in the Middle Ages. But besides this admission, generous and fruitful, of the Church's rights, there is another most important difference between mediæval and modern times in the different circumstances, and especially in the very different states of society during the two periods.

In the first place, all the nations of mediæval Christendom agreed in faith, and, whatever their practice, admitted the same principles of faith as the final test of right and wrong. What are now frequently laid down as the first principles of politics were rejected by the Middle Ages, as principles, with horror. The system of non-intervention, of "accomplished facts," of tolerating infidelity and heresy, were against public conscience as well as against public law. Uncharitableness and injustice were crimes, whenever committed, and however speciously coloured. Peace-making was a virtue for its own sake, irrespective of self-interest.

Besides this internal unity, there was the external unity in the fact, to which we have already alluded, that the nations formed a Christian confederation, the secular head of which depended more or less for his appointment and maintenance upon the supreme Church authority. The Pope came thus to be at once the head and the centre of the social system. He could therefore speak with the power and authority of the head of a family. In these days there is nothing analogous to this power. We see a sort of reflection of it now and then in the influence exercised by a Buonaparte or a Bismarck. But how different even this influence, transient and contracted, founded perhaps on lawless might, at best on the character or position of an individual, from the great, universal power of the Papal office, founded on the noblest aspirations of man, confirmed and maintained by law, deep-rooted in past ages, sanctified by religion, and exerted only to further the noblest interests of humanity!

But perhaps the most important circumstance to be considered in estimating the conditions which determined the Church's action in the Middle Ages, is the state of society at the time. We are not blind to the faults of the Middle Ages. They were, in general, the faults of a people passing from semi-barbarism to civilization, from childhood to manhood.

The half-controlled passions of those strong fierce natures broke forth continually into acts of violence, of cruelty, of oppression, of lust. On the other hand flourished far more luxuriantly the virtues of such a primitive and transition state. There was a childlike earnest faith in the unseen world, an attraction, unfettered by idle conventionalities, to all that was holy, and pure, and noble—a humble sense of dependence on superior power or wisdom. Hearts were ardent and enthusiastic, minds simple and true, wills earnest, tractable, and religious. It is hard to say whether the good or the evil of the Middle Ages more completely justifies the action of the Church. To deal with such men there was needed a power founded on sanctions which should make even the fiercest tremble, yet at the same time so gentle in its manifestation as to attract the timid, and to invite repentance;—a power able to raise the most ignorant and degraded, and yet capable of satisfying the aspirations of the noblest and most cultivated natures. A religion mysterious and awful in its doctrines and its rites, yet tangible to the least educated faculty. A religion at once above the people, yet amidst them; above them to satisfy their feelings of mysterious reverence, yet amidst them to fulfil the exuberant fresh love of their ardent childlike hearts; above them to terrify and chastise the oppressor, the ravisher, the marauder, amidst them to receive the penitent, to heal the broken spirit, to cherish with maternal love the poor and timid, but religious heart. Such a power the Church alone possessed, or rather such a power she *was*. And this fact, while it is a glorious proof of her supernatural origin, forms at the same time a complete justification of her action. In such circumstances she had not only a right but a strict duty to interfere. On this we particularly wish to insist, the more so, as our author does not give this fact the prominence we think it deserves. The natural law imposes upon us a definite obligation, in certain circumstances, of using any power we may happen to possess. Thus, a doctor is bound to help a dying man when other bystanders have no such obligation, simply because he possesses the required knowledge. In the same way the Church, from the mere fact that she possessed, or for that matter was credited with, the power to restrain the passions of those fierce nobles, to curb the despotism of the tyrannical sovereigns of the Middle Ages, was *bound* to use it. She was the only refuge of the oppressed, the poor, and the afflicted, and she was bound to succour them. In such a way as this came her duty to protest against and to forbid unjust taxes, tolls, and other exactions when made, as they usually were, merely to feed the

avarice, ambition, or selfish pleasures of a despot. Chiefly were her rulers bound to interfere to support herself, the Church, the only principle of stability and rescue, as well as the nominee of Almighty God, against all attacks.

We trust that we have sufficiently defended the Church against the charge of usurpation which is made against her general action in the Middle Ages, and we come now to vindicate her action from the general charges which are made against it as regards modern times.

She is now accused of setting herself, as it were out of spite, and because her claims are ignored, in determined hostility to modern ideas and the modern State. All that is necessary for us here, as in defending her conduct in the Middle Ages, is to gain a true idea of the conditions on which judgment has to be given. It needs a very slight consideration to see that these are entirely altered. The very concept of the State is changed, the rights of the Church, here and there grudgingly and partially admitted, are, in most places, refused and ridiculed, and the state of society is completely changed.

The Reformation opened the floodgates to this torrent of revolution. The whole process is so magnificently described by our author in the words of Von Moy, that we are sure our readers will thank us for giving the description at length.

After showing that in the Middle Ages the Church was recognized as the essential form of Christianity, after developing, as the consequence of this truth, the principles which we have already laid down on the true relations of Church and State, he proceeds:—

All this has been changed by the Reformation, which recognized, indeed, the supernatural end that had been given to our earthly life by Christianity, but rejected the Divine institution of the Church with her sacerdotal and teaching office. The work of the Church was thus transferred to the State, and the Church made an institution of the State. Religion became at once a serviceable instrument in politics, and this occurred not merely in Protestant, but also in Catholic countries, for the need of protection against the violence and encroachments of Protestantism gave such great prominence to the civil sword and state authority, and made the position of the rulers of the Church so difficult that, even in Catholic countries, the State grievously encroached on the religious domain. This abuse was formally erected into a system, and called, in France, Gallicanism; in Germany, Febronianism or Josephism; in Spain and Portugal, Pombalism. It was a system of hypocrisy and meanness, and its results were soon evident. In the Protestant States the Reformation continued its work of disintegration, and the break-up into a multitude of sects at length rendered it impossible for the government to continue their ecclesiastical dominion; in the Catholic states

the depreciation and misuse of all that was most holy, the insubordination of the powerful, and the powerlessness of the clergy, shook the faith of the masses, and in a great measure wholly destroyed that of the upper classes. This led to the French Revolution, which rejected Christianity and the Church alike, and set up the State anew as an institution reposing simply on human wills, and existing simply for this life, and for earthly ends. This is the "Modern State," according to the pattern of which all other states of Europe have gradually transformed themselves, and made its constitution and principles their own. When it first arose it made a vigorous attempt to extirpate Christianity, and a weak attempt to create a heathen religion as a support for itself. As both failed, it had to allow Christianity to exist, but only as a matter of personal taste and individual opinion—only as a form, in itself indifferent, of religious views, having no claim whatever to political influence or recognized legal position. This is the modern principle of "freedom of conscience," which is as necessarily and essentially connected with the modern State as the idea of the finite with that of the infinite (E. I. p. 23).

Those conditions then which we considered as justifying the Church's action in the Middle Age do not now exist. Hence her concrete rights and duties and claims are quite altered.

In the first place, her principles and rights are not recognized, nay, are denied. Her rights have only moral force, and are therefore practically, though not theoretically, dependent on the consent of men. When this, for one reason or another, is refused, the Church not only ceases to be bound to assert her rights, but, we may say she cannot, consistently with justice and charity, assert them. She cannot claim the same authority over Protestant England, as over Catholic England, over Queen Victoria, who is ignorant of her authority, as over Queen Elizabeth, who rebelled against it. Such a change reduces a right of command to a mere duty of warning.

As for the less essential and special rights and privileges of the Church, they have all disappeared, and she stands, as it were, naked before the all-powerful State. This is the reality and substance of that terrible bugbear which free-thinkers and displaced politicians, and, alas! liberal Catholics, love to parade before an ignorant and prejudiced world. Because the Church, using under favourable circumstances the powers given her by Christ, the powers acknowledged by men, the further powers given her by wise and grateful peoples, interfered to protect right and punish wrong at a certain period of the world's history, when no other protector existed, therefore, forsooth, when powerless, oppressed, and patient, she must be so dreaded that no liberty can be allowed her.

In the second place, the circumstances of the age, and especially the state of society, are now entirely different. We

defended the action of the Church in the Middle Ages, partly on the ground of the religious unity of that time. The religious dissensions of modern times, as they alter the condition, change also the relative obligations of Church and State.

And as there is no common religion, so there is no head of a religious commonwealth. Nor have the spiritual rulers in any country direct influence over the appointment of sovereigns. Here again the Church, instead of exercising any right of protest, and refusal, can only observe a prayerful silence.

Finally, and perhaps chiefly, the changed state of society in modern times relieves the Church of many of those duties which were imposed upon her by her position as sole guardian of public justice, sole refuge of the oppressed, sole bulwark against tyranny. Though we consider that, when the Church was recognized, subjects enjoyed far more of real liberty, though we consider the modern state to be in theory, as our author says, a despotism founded on physical force, or the brute will of a majority,—careless of that Divine sanction which upholds the real rights equally of rulers and of subjects—though we know that the Church would have led the world to a civilization far nobler, because more Christian, than the world can ever reach by its own powers,—still we admit that the Church's influence is less absolutely necessary to the social order now than it was a thousand years ago. Liberty of opinion and speech is a substitute, though a poor one, for the mighty power of the Church in checking despotism. There is a general respect for law and order. Passion is more under control. Each State possesses a government able to protect the rights of property. Justice is, on the whole, well administered.

It is unfair, then, to argue that the modern Church makes the same practical claims as did the mediæval Church. It is equally unfair to pretend that the Church considers the refusal of her claims to justify her in setting herself in opposition to the State. She cannot, indeed, admit the theoretical principles on which the modern State professes to rely, but it is false that she cannot, as her opponents assert, come to any terms with the State. On the contrary, she imposes on her children a full and loyal general acceptance of its authority. Witness the condemned proposition (63) of the Syllabus—"We may refuse obedience to lawful princes, nay, may rebel against them." And lest the term "lawful" should be considered, as adversaries pretend to consider it, an ambiguous term, it will be well to bring forward some formal proof of the loyalty of the Church even to the non-Catholic modern State.

As to our own country, although indeed S. Pius V., on the principles of mediæval law, then still acknowledged by the greater part of Europe, forbade obedience to the rebellious heretic Queen Elizabeth, his immediate successor suspended the force of the Bull, the title of James I. was fully recognized, and from that time to this, in spite of persecution and oppression far greater than that which drove non-Catholic Englishmen into open rebellion against the house of Stuart, the Catholics of Great Britain have kept unshaken fidelity to their sovereign. Surely, in face of such a fact and with the very evidence of our present loyalty, it is not only malicious but most unfair to say that the Catholics of Great Britain do not acknowledge Queen Victoria as their lawful queen. On the Continent again, is it not clear, as much from the manner of their opposition in what they consider wrong as from their loyal obedience to the general law, that Catholics acknowledge their rulers to have a claim on their true allegiance? Is it not evident that the Catholics of Germany, of Belgium, of Russia, acknowledge their princes to be their "lawful princes"?

The Church indeed may and must forbid her children to obey such commands of the State as may be against the law of God, but this does not interfere with their general allegiance. Pius VI. condemned the "civil constitution of the French clergy," but he upheld the authority which introduced it (H., I. 57). Pius VII. speaks in the same sense, and we would especially recommend to our readers the words of Gregory XVI. (ib., pp. 60, 61), in which, while he beautifully expresses his own doctrine, he exhibits it at the same time as in perfect accordance with that of his predecessors. The only real question for the spiritual authority to consider is whether the rulers in the modern State are "ordained of God . . . the ministers of God" (Rom. xiii.). Such the Church fully admits modern rulers to be, as being the guardians of the social order, as acknowledged by the society in which they rule. And their claim on our obedience is not negatived by the fact that the law or social system which they administer and defend may contain some anti-Christian principles. To these of course we cannot give our adhesion, and yet our loyalty is not thereby impaired. We recognize the State's general authority because God sanctions it; such commands as are without His sanction have no claim on our obedience. Catholics do not, as many moderns do, make the State infallible, all-powerful, the fountain of all rights; but they allow it a real authority, limited, like all human authority, to that which is according to God's law. There is an exact parallel in the history of early Christianity. Indeed, we

appear, as the author remarks, in many ways to be approaching a state of things analogous to that which prevailed in the time of the Apostles. And as their refusal of obedience, in regard of the teaching of the Gospel, to the Jewish authorities, did not prejudice their general obedience,* and as the rejection by the early Christians of such State laws as prescribed idolatry did not "divide their allegiance," so the obedient children of the Church in these days can and do shine also as obedient, faithful subjects of the State.

We have now completed the first part of our task, and we trust that we have sufficiently proved that the principles of the Church regarding her own power are and have been, in themselves and in their application, consistent with a full recognition of civil authority.

II. We come now to those essays which treat of the great historical facts brought forward to support the charges, and especially the charge of usurpation, made against the Mediæval Church.

Our space will not allow us to treat all these important subjects in full. We will therefore select as a specimen the Essay (VIII.) on S. Gregory VII.

This is of course devoted chiefly to the history of his contest with Henry IV. of Germany. With regard to this contest we will, in the first place, briefly remind our readers of the facts as given by our author (pt. I. §§ 1—7).

Henry had already given grave trouble to the predecessors of Gregory, in their efforts to reform the Church. He had led a scandalously immoral life, usurped the Church revenues, and encouraged simony. Still the new Pontificate opened under fair auspices. Henry, already in difficulties with his Saxon subjects, was induced to seek a reconciliation with the Holy See, promising repentance and obedience. For some time relations continued friendly, but as Henry's difficulties lessened he began to return to his wicked courses, and the Pope, who had previously had to complain of his faithlessness and neglect, at the end of the year 1075 "wrote to him"—we quote the words of a Protestant historian—"as the last trial of kindness, a threatening letter, couched in language of paternal severity, but at the same time tempered with gentleness."† The con-

* "Be ye subject to every human creature for God's sake" (1 Peter ii. 13). The Greek is *κρισις*, which, from the context, is clearly to be rendered *constitution* or *form of government*.

† "He that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God" (Romans xiii. 2).

Thus clearly did the Church, by the mouths of her greatest and earliest teachers, declare for all time the duty of obedience to the civil power.

† Neander, vol. vii. p. 13.

tents of this letter certainly gave Henry, after his professions, no fair ground of offence. If Gregory points out his serious faults, he makes the kindest promises, and goes so far as to offer to meet the king halfway on the subject of investitures. Shortly after this letter Gregory despatched three envoys to urge the considerations which it expressed, exhorting Henry to change his conduct, and threatening him, in case of refusal, with that excommunication which must be the punishment of such crimes. Surely up to this point no exception can fairly be taken to Gregory's action by those who remember that Henry had acknowledged Gregory to be his spiritual superior, and the Vicar of Christ. But the haughty and headstrong king, under the influence of evil counsellors, dismissed the envoys in an insulting manner, and had the audacity to make his synod of Worms pass a sentence of deposition, as illegal as it was futile, on Gregory. Gregory, who was in council at Rome when he received the announcement of this act of rebellion, calmly and with the consent of 100 bishops, proceeded to pass the threatened sentence of excommunication upon Henry, and to release his subjects from the obligation of their oath of allegiance. This, however, was not a real deposition; it was merely a suspension, and was only to come into full force by the contumacy of Henry, that is, by his remaining under the ban for a year and a day. This consequence was admitted by the Germans themselves as German law. The princes at Tribur determined to proceed to a new election. After fruitless negotiations with them, Henry was forced to agree to the conditions they imposed. The chief of them was that the Pope should be invited to a great assembly of the princes at Augsburg, to meet on the 2nd February, 1077, and there should finally decide on all the accusations against Henry. Meanwhile Henry was to live privately at Spiers as an excommunicated man. He started immediately for Italy to seek the absolution of the Pope, and in January, 1077, met him at Canossa, on his way to join the assembly. After voluntarily giving such proofs of repentance as the spirit of church discipline in that age would have required, he obtained absolution on what we must consider, under the circumstances, the most easy condition, that he should not resume his imperial rights until he had met and satisfied his accusers. The fickle king had hardly left the Pope's presence, when, finding himself strong in the support of his Lombard partisans, he broke through all his promises, put himself in direct opposition to Gregory, and prevented him from continuing his journey to the assembly, now necessarily deferred. The impatient princes in Germany proceeded to a new election, naming Rudolph of Suabia, a

man in every way pleasing to the Pope, as their future emperor. But the Pope held firmly to his purpose and first decision, and notwithstanding the faithlessness of Henry, and the bitter complaints of Rudolph's party, insisted on deciding nothing till a fair deliberation had taken place. It is a clear proof how completely Gregory's action is prejudged by most of his opponents, that instead of praising him for his disinterested impartiality, it is only made a new charge against him. Surely it is unfair to reproach a judge who is called on to decide between two parties, because he insists on remaining neutral till the legal inquiry has been made. The civil war, which raged through the disobedience and impatience of the parties concerned, can no more be laid to the charge of Gregory than could a duel between two litigating parties be laid to the charge of a judge who was reserving his decision till the parties had presented their case.

Besides, Gregory's decision would rather have had the effect of embittering the struggle, as is evident from the fact that when, at last (in 1080), Henry's contumacy and fresh crimes had really put him beyond the benefit of the Pope's help, and Gregory was obliged to give his support to Rudolph, the contest became more fierce than ever. Rudolph was slain in the same year, and Gregory was in the power of Henry. Violence prevailed over justice, and Gregory was driven into exile, where he died, 1085.

This brief outline of the facts, with our antecedent and accompanying remarks, seems to us enough by itself to justify the conduct of Gregory. But we prefer to give a more exact and formal defence, and at the risk of repetition will briefly show that Gregory had a right to excommunicate Henry and to release his subjects from their obedience to him; that he was justified in using this right, and that he used it with Christian moderation.

It seems to us that, with regard to the abstract right of excommunicating sovereigns who are also members of the Church, there can be no question. Protestants and Catholics agree in this. S. Paul only appealed to the necessary privilege of a society when he said, commanding the excommunication of a scandalous sinner, "Do you not judge those who are within?" (1 Cor. v.). Gregory could appeal to many precedents as well as to established law (H., VIII. 393-4). The temporal consequence of such excommunication is a different thing, and varies according to the laws and principles of the time. We must repeat that it is not fair to judge the Middle Ages by the ideas of modern times. We do not maintain that in these days excommunication would include

deposition and the other temporal consequences which it included in the days of which we write. At that time these temporal consequences were admitted by civil as well as by canon law, and the opposition of a few interested partisans of Henry cannot fairly be allowed to weigh against the consent of all impartial authorities. We maintain, then, that Gregory certainly had the right to excommunicate Henry, and as a consequence of this, in that age, to forbid his subjects to obey him.

And, in the second place, we say emphatically that Gregory was more than justified in using the right which he possessed. The crisis was tremendous. The most important Church interests were at stake. Simony and incontinence, like canker-worms, had eaten into all ranks of the clergy, so that in some places, notably in Germany, the laity had begun to refuse their ministration of the sacraments. And the great crying evil was that temporal rulers, for selfish and ambitious purposes, encouraged and upheld these shameful abuses. Gregory was the instrument used by God to rescue His Church. Impartial Protestant historians acknowledge his zeal and disinterestedness. It was impossible for him to carry out his great purpose so long as there was at the head of the temporal polity of Europe a ruler who, to scandalous immorality and public encouragement of simony, added an open and audacious opposition against the head of the Church. We say that, against such a mighty evil, Gregory was not only allowed, but bound to proceed, if necessary, to the very extremity of his power.

We maintain, in the third place, that, all things considered, Gregory used his power with moderation, nay, with gentleness and forbearance. It is enough, for this purpose, to compare his conduct with the conduct of Henry. Gregory overlooked Henry's early bad conduct, bore with him till greater forbearance would have made him a co-operator in Henry's sin; forgave Henry's insults and rebellion, refused, in spite of every petition and reproach to declare against him till his contumacy was evident; treated him in fact like a son, while Henry was provoking him by every species of crime and of outrage. And we must remember that it was far more to Gregory's interest to have Henry as a friend than as an enemy; and even had his personal feelings inclined him against the king, prudence, which Neander admits to have been one of Gregory's most distinguishing characteristics, forbade him to use his power tyrannously. When such all-important interests were not at stake, as in the case of Philip of France and of William the Conqueror, Gregory employed milder means; and here we may remark that it is more reasonable to argue

that the severer measures which he took against Henry were a consequence of the greater exigencies of the case, than to accuse him, as anti-Catholic writers do, of partiality and unfairness when he strove to gain by milder means a less absolutely essential end.

We shall not dwell on the other and less important charges against Gregory, which are treated by our author in the second and third parts of his essay. We will only say that with regard to his asserted claim of sovereignty over all kingdoms, that it is false, but has this specious appearance of truth, that many princes were actually his vassals by the voluntary act of themselves or of their predecessors. It is true also that Gregory, for the sake of the better enforcement of Christian principles, wished for the closest connection between all Imperial rulers and the Holy See; but the author clearly proves that, as a fact, he asserted no other than a spiritual authority over France, or over many other countries of Europe. The other essays of this series we must dismiss with a few brief remarks, though there is not one which does not deserve careful study.

Essay VII. is a detailed proof that the secular power in the Middle Ages fully acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Pope. The first part of the essay proves this specially with regard to royal marriages. The cases brought forward range from the ninth to the thirteenth century, and include those of Lothair II., Robert of France, and, in greater detail, that of Philip I. of France, and the numerous cases which occurred under the Pontificate of Innocent III.

The second part of the essay is devoted to the detail of the many other ways in which princes recognized the authority of the Pope. As late as the ninth century the power even of ordinary bishops to excommunicate sovereigns was recognized by sovereigns themselves. This power, however, on account of abuses, was reserved to the Holy See. To the Pope princes appeal to decide disputes between themselves or with their subjects; usurpers seek his countenance or acknowledgment; titles of honour are asked from him; letters to him express the profound respect even of the greatest sovereigns. He is asked to confirm treaties, privileges, donations, petitions, wills. And as it is sometimes asserted that this arose only from ignorance on the part of princes, the author shows (§ 13) that this charge of ignorance, as against all princes in the Middle Ages, is quite unfounded. Where it existed it was deplored, and was a consequence, not of Church influence, which lay always in the opposite direction, but of the bad state of the times.

Essay IX. is, as its title imports, an account of the relations between the Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire. It exhibits in considerable detail the process by which the office of Emperor gradually threw off its ecclesiastical character and dependence on the Pope, and assumed an entirely secular aspect. A special division is given to the important contest between Frederick II. and the Papacy. To this essay more than to any other applies the remark in our short notice (Jan. 1876), that the work is almost too rich in details. We have no breathing-space; no time to apprehend the significance of the innumerable facts and arguments heaped together by our author's wonderful research. In one point we think the author's words calculated to give a false impression. From the time that Otho I. rescued the Papacy from the tyranny of the Italian princes and established what we may call the German Roman Empire, it became recognized that the king of Germany should have an *ex-officio* claim to the imperial dignity. The Popes willingly acknowledged this claim, but, in return for the sacrifice which they thus made of independent appointment, they required that the electors should present an acceptable and qualified man. So long, therefore, as the electors claimed the Empire for their king, the Popes claimed this negative influence over the election even of the king. In the case of a disputed election it became of practical importance. The author seems to speak as if the Popes claimed no control whatever over the election of the king of Germany (E. IX. p. 16). They certainly claimed a greater authority with regard to this than with regard to the election of any other monarch (see notes 4, p. 16, and 10, p. 17).

Essay X., "The Popes and their Vassal Kingdoms," is a detailed proof of what we have already shown in general, that in addition to her essential rights the Church received many special and important rights from the concession and gift of men. At one time most of the princes of Europe had made themselves vassals of the Holy See. There was nothing degrading in this vassalage. It was only an acknowledgment of the Pope's authority, and gave a special claim on the protection of the Church. The essay is full of important facts in justification of the Popes of the Middle Ages. In speaking of Innocent III. and Magna Charta the author would have done well to recall the fact that Innocent only condemned the manner in which it had been extorted,* and promised the barons that all grievances should be abolished, the crown

* Lingard, ii. p. 181, ed. Dolman, 1854. Card. Manning, *Contemp. Rev.*, Dec. 1875.

restrained to its just rights, and the ancient liberties of clergy and people should be vindicated.

Essay XI. discusses the doctrine and conduct of Boniface VIII., and in particular the doctrinal bearing of the celebrated Bull "*Unam sanctam*." We will not here discuss this; because in April, 1875 (pp. 489-491) we set forth what to us appears the more probable opinion on the matter, and we need only refer our readers to what we there said.

Essay XII. treats of the gifts of land made by the Popes, and the Donation of Constantine. Each of these topics furnishes our author with a new opportunity of vindicating Catholic truth and exposing the misrepresentations of adversaries. With regard to the lands of unbelievers, the Pope certainly used no greater authority than he was considered to possess. His aim was not directly to assert any power over such countries, but to prevent or settle the disputes of Christian princes, and to carry out the commission of the Church to "teach all nations." Such matters naturally came before the Pope as the head of Christendom. The whole question of conquest and colonization is complicated and obscure. Few problems of morality present greater difficulties. Certainly the Pope's decision had far more authority than the treaties made by any secular government. It is hardly necessary to point out that even supposing an error in this matter on the part of the Pope, this could have no bearing on the dogma of Infallibility.

In the second part of this Essay the author exposes the absurdity of the view which makes the Donation of Constantine the foundation of the so-called Papal system of universal sovereignty. He shows that this document was first appealed to by three Frankish writers of the ninth century. Only seven Popes appeal to it, the first being Leo IX. in the eleventh century, who alone appeals to it in anything more than a casual way. No opposition was made by Rome to those who from the fifteenth century began to call in question its authenticity. The Papal power rested on entirely different grounds, upon principles and ideas which had universal acceptance, as indeed sensible and candid Protestants acknowledge. In this connection a few words on the spurious *Dictatus* of Gregory VII., and a somewhat more extended treatment of the Pseudo-Isidorean decretals would not have been out of place.

The eighteenth and last Essay, on "the Claims of later Popes," really belongs to the series which we are considering, of answers to historical objections against mediæval principles and practice. To these, as to the essential principles or

legitimate development of Christianity, the Popes consistently held, and this necessarily brought them into collision with the representatives of the new and revolutionary order. The Essay consists of an examination of the chief objections made against the later Popes; such as the excommunication of Henry VIII., and of Elizabeth, the case of Ridolfi, &c.

III. We come now to the third division of our article. This includes the various urgent dogmatic questions treated by our author. The most important of them,—indeed, as we have said, the very keynote of the book,—is the Infallibility of the Pope, treated in Essay II. The author divides his subject into three parts according to the three great objections brought against the doctrine.

His first thesis, that the dogma of Papal Infallibility is not *irrational*, he proves by exposing the misconceptions and false statements on which alone this statement can be supported. Of these the chief, perhaps, is that Infallibility invests the Pope with a certain *quality* which, like impeccability, as it is called, is an attribute of God alone. To answer this it is only necessary to recall the words of the definition. The Pope is *invested* with nothing. Infallibility as applied to the Pope expresses only a negative attribute. On its positive side it is rather an attribute or action of the Holy Spirit than of the Pope, and signifies that assistance of the Holy Spirit which preserves the Pope from error when speaking as Supreme Teacher of the Church on a matter of faith and morals. From this description of Papal Infallibility it follows:—

(1) That the Pope possesses an official, and not a personal Infallibility. This at once disposes of all the objections drawn from the personal character, from the crimes or ignorance of the individual Pope.

(2) That the Pope is not infallible in his governing or in his legislative capacity. Therefore, as Fessler has abundantly shown against Schulte, possible or actual mistakes in the government of the Church, unseasonable decrees, unjust censures, tyrannical commands, which may form matter of objection against the governing power, do not in any way affect the Infallibility of the Pope.

(3) That the Pope is not infallible when speaking on merely temporal matters, or even on spiritual matters in his private capacity. Nor in his speeches, his ordinary letters, or his conversation.

(4) That possessing only security from error, he has no inspiration, no creative dogmatic power.

The definition alone is therefore enough to answer most of

the objections against the reasonableness of the dogma of Infallibility. Those who object that it is liable to abuse, or that it interferes with the teaching office of the bishops, receive an equally complete answer (p. 83 and p. 85). The translator does, perhaps, a little injustice to the author when he makes him say (p. 86) that the Pope must "*expressly state*" his intention of binding the faithful in virtue of his office of Supreme Teacher. The author only says he must "*express*" (*ausdrücken*) this intention. If he really means what the translator makes him say, he is not only mistaken, as his own references show, but, as we pointed out in our short notice (Jan., 1876), contradicts himself. It is evidently only an inexact expression.

The second part of his thesis, that the dogma is not *new*, is proved, of course, by an appeal to Scripture and tradition.

In § 1 the author develops the ordinary Scripture proof. In § 2 he treats the canon of Vincent of Lerins. He remarks that Vincent does not say we are to believe *only* "*quod semper*," &c. Otherwise, as the author very well remarks, there would have been no heresies, and the very fact of a dispute would have made the Church unable to decide it. The exact rule of faith is, of course, "*that must be believed which the Church proposes for belief.*" The canon gives a subordinate rule which may enable individuals to discover that which, without being actually defined, is still proposed by the Church. In this way the doctrine of Infallibility was binding on many individuals before its definition, and indeed was the universal belief of the Church before the unhappy schism of the West, and the Council of Constance. He concludes this section by the apposite question: "Can the opponents of the dogma prove, on the other hand, that the fallibility of the Pope in defining matters of faith has been believed everywhere, always, and of all men?"

Our readers must study for themselves the author's excellent treatment of the historical testimonies to Infallibility given in §§ 3, 4, 5.

§ 5 deals with the convincing proof from the Formula of Pope Hormisdas (519). In § 6, while admitting that obedience and faith are different in themselves, it is shown that *obedience in matters of faith* requires a submission of the intellect, and that therefore *respectful silence*, which was indeed condemned in the Jansenists by the Bull "*In vineam Domini*," is not real obedience in matters of faith. § 7 gives the proof from the Council of Florence, and in §§ 8, 9 are answered the difficulties regarding the Councils of Constance and Basle. In § 9 the author clearly develops the

argument, which cannot be too strongly insisted on, that "in the ancient principle that there is no appeal from a Papal decision to a higher authority, the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope is clearly contained." We strongly recommend the last section (10) of this part to those who still maintain the figment that Papal Infallibility is a creation of modern times.

The third part of the author's thesis is that the definition or doctrine of Papal Infallibility is not dangerous to the State. Much has been said on this point in answer to the attacks of Mr. Gladstone and others; and for ourselves we will here do no more than refer to the remarks which were made when Mr. Gladstone first preferred his most unreasonable indictment. See our number for January, 1876, pp. 178, 9.

Essay III. bears for its title "The Vatican Council." We must content ourselves with a very brief summary of its contents. In the first part the author proves that the opponents of the Council are heretics. He shows that their principle is the Protestant principle of private judgment, and that in their conduct and in the objections which they raise, they exactly resemble the Arians, the Donatists, the Jansenists, and other heretics.

In the second part are disproved their false and scandalous charges against the Council; but he remarks that their special charges, such as want of freedom or new method of procedure, are merely a cover to their real attack, which is directed against the dogma itself. In the fifth section of this part the author refers to another of those great historical arguments for the Infallibility to be overthrown by no trifling or irrelevant facts which the microscopic ingenuity of *scientific history* may discover. "No council, however numerous, has ever obtained universal recognition if rejected by the Roman See, and only those acknowledged by Rome have been acknowledged also by the whole Church." Their refusal to accept the decision of the majority as the decision of the Council, and their demand for moral unanimity (§ 10) is not only opposed to the custom of all deliberative and judicial assemblies, is not only against the history of all the early general councils, but is completely nullified by the fact that the decision of the Vatican Council *was* given with a most striking moral unanimity. Only two bishops, and these afterwards gave in to the general voice, voted *non placet* on the decisive day. The extra-conciliar protest of 52 bishops cannot be allowed any weight against the decision of 533 bishops in council, with the confirmation of the Pope. The request of a certain portion of the German press that the decision should rest with the few

bishops who formed the minority, on the ground that they were the most intelligent members of the Council, and represented the most intelligent populations, would be amusing in its absurdity if it were not an evidence of the most insufferable pride.

Throughout this essay, and, indeed, throughout the whole work, we find sad proof of the malicious hatred entertained by the opponents of the Vatican Council against that Church of which they profess to be the devoted children. We find continual proof of their blindness with regard to the real significance of history, and of their insincerity in their treatment of it. We find them continually appealing to popular prejudice, and fostering the jealousy and hatred which the secular power already entertains with regard to the Church. The third part of this essay is devoted to an exposure of the real end to which such conduct and such appeals must lead. The author shows that the demands and aims of the new heretics are not only absurd and impracticable, and contrary to the spirit of the Church, but also that they play into the hands of that state-absolutism which, in its final development, would swallow up Christianity itself.

Essay IV. is entitled "The Pope and the Bishops." One of the most frequent objections against the Vatican Council is that it has abolished episcopal jurisdiction, and reduced the bishops to the position of mere papal deputies. This charge is proved to be utterly untrue in both its parts.

In the first place, the bishops are not the mere deputies of the Pope. It does not follow because the Pope has supreme, and *ordinary*, and immediate episcopal power throughout the whole Church, that bishops have not also a real and *ordinary* power.

In the second place, whatever the relation of the bishops to the Pastor of Pastors, the Vatican Council made no change in this relation. No doubt, since the first ages of the Church, there has been a change in the administration of the Church authority. It has been necessary for the Popes gradually to reserve many of the powers which were at first committed, by tacit or express commission, to patriarchs and primates. But this change was long ago consummated, and it is most dishonest to place it to the charge of the Vatican Council. That the plenitude of Church authority resides in the Pope has always been the established doctrine of the Church, and is taken for granted in the Council of Trent, and in earlier councils. This has long been a standing objection of Protestant historians against the Catholic Church. For instance, Gieseler says, speaking of the period between Gregory VII.

and Innocent III., "The Pseudo-Isidorean idea that the Pope is universal bishop caused the bishops to sink into mere vicars of the Pope" (K. G., p. 206). And Neander: "From the time of Gregory VII. the government became an unlimited monarchy; the triumph of papal absolutism was complete. All other ecclesiastical authority was but the Pope's organ" (vii. 268).

In the second part of this essay the author shows that the Vatican Council did not decide the question whether episcopal jurisdiction comes to the individual bishop through the Pope as through its mediate source, but he shows at the same time that the affirmative is the common doctrine of theologians, and in a note (p. 182) he refers to no fewer than *ninety* authors who support it.

The third part of this essay is a powerful and sustained proof that the power of the Pope is not arbitrary or absolute, and that the power of the bishops is real, and, in fact, just what it was before the Vatican Constitution. Out of their own mouths does our author convict his opponents. The quotations from Schulte and others, especially the quotation from Dollinger (p. 197), are most telling. And he shows that it is practically a choice for the bishops between being what they are and being vicars of the civil power.

Essay V. is on "The Syllabus." We have already considered most of the second part of this essay, in which the most important and difficult propositions are treated separately. The first part, in which is considered the dogmatic force of the Syllabus taken as a whole, we earnestly recommend to the attention of those who may still feel a difficulty about accepting it with complete submission. The author's decision, as we stated in the short notice above referred to, is that the Syllabus is a dogmatic judgment in a *wide sense*; that all the propositions which it contains are pronounced infallibly to deserve censure in a greater or a less degree.

There remain still two essays to be considered, but we have already exceeded our space, and we can only say that they treat, according to the true Catholic tradition, the urgent questions of the punishment of heresy and liberty of conscience. We leave them with less reluctance because these questions have been discussed in earlier numbers of this Review.

We trust that we have now given our readers an accurate and sufficiently distinct outline of Hergenröther's work, and we shall be well rewarded if we induce them to study for themselves this splendid vindication of Church authority.

Against this fundamental doctrine the chief attacks of this

age of heresy and free thought are directed, and our defence and safeguard consist, of course, in a realization of the true character, history, and teaching of the Church. Our devotion to the Church must increase in proportion as she is more hotly assailed. To cultivate this devotion is the very object of such works as that which we have reviewed. Here we find a thorough and clear exposition and defence of our faith. Here we find matter to answer the cavils of bigoted enemies of the Church, and the inquiries of earnest seekers after truth. Here we find wherewith to encourage and confirm our weaker and less-instructed brethren. But the chief advantage and necessity of such works is to keep our own faith bright and ardent. Too easily, alas! is its precious light weakened or disturbed. There is so strong a temptation to adopt a little of the cynical tone of those around us, it is so easy to yield to fear or shame in the profession of our faith. The remedy is ready to our hand. "The truth will make us free"; free from all doubt and distrust, full of loyalty and devotion. We shall realize our glorious privilege as children of the Church when we see how false the charges that are brought against her, when we see how bright, and noble, and wise, and holy, and *divine* she is. We shall love the Church as Christ "also loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it . . . that He might present to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, nor any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. v.).

ART. III.—THE POETRY OF A PESSIMIST.

Poésies Philosophiques. Par L. ACKERMANN. Quatrième édition. Paris : Alphonse Lemerre. 1877.

IT appears from the writings of the German philosopher, Schopenhauer, that, after all his reflections, he came to the conclusion that the world was so purposeless, and so full of misery, that it would have been better if the universe had never been. Many others shared his opinion, and share it now. The world is for them like a great machine, in which the human race is entangled to be perpetually tortured and crushed. Long dwelling upon the mysteries of the darker side of man's lot has made them forget the brighter points

of life, or rendered its pleasures scarcely discernible in the general confusion and darkness. These minds are clear enough to follow their opinions to their ultimate conclusions; they have the honesty to face their full meaning, and acknowledge that it is bitter; and at times they make known the spectacle which man's existence presents to them. They refuse to see it except with the bodily sense, yet are forced to confess that, thus viewed, it can only be described as a scene of tumult and anguish, universal, meaningless, but admitting of no escape for the great multiplying race that are doomed to be its victims.

There are in these days countless numbers, who, peering through a sunless darkness, take a purely human view of life; but they take it not in the logical unflinching spirit in which the German philosopher acknowledged that the mystery was not only inexplicable, but on all sides most terrible. They rather adopt shadowy ideas of regeneration, and progress, a gradual breaking away from the shackles of this evil state of things, a sunrise of which they have dreamt for ages, when the gods of the world will be Culture and Prosperity, and there will begin a new era of universal light, man learning at last to be wise. These hopeful views form a wide-spread creed, which finds expression in the melodious verse of the new school of modern poetry: in the grave philosophical teachings and systems of social economy of those men who are proudly styled the thinkers of the day; and above all in the deeds and political movements of that so-called party of progress, but really of retrogression, which is spread through every country of Europe, and whose work is known to itself by a hundred different names, but to us by the one ominous word, the Revolution.

All these people, whether statesmen, political agitators, orators, guides of public thought, poets, or the numberless individuals in private life who advocate free-thought—all these with the same groundwork of scepticism have opinions varying in every shade from broad brightness to utter darkness. We speak of opinions, of the mind's hopefulness or despair of the welfare of itself and of the whole race, not of those gradations of feeling which are to be found among the unbelieving multitude, where some are "sad as death," while others cry out with the pagan, Eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die. The diversity of thought is almost infinite between those who are the disciples of the regeneration theory, who expect human kind to progress to an ideal state of bliss with a godless society; and the opposite extreme, who hold that life is not worth living, though it is the life that the myriads yet to

be must in their turn endure. Human existence is to them the embodiment of vain longings, hopeless grief, endless toil. They have not even as much light in their thoughts as that poet hoping for the dawn, who once sang that the high gods made man, taking—

Fire and the falling of tears
And a measure of sliding sand
From under the feet of the years
In his heart is a blind desire
In his eyes foreknowledge of death ;
He weaves and is clothed with derision,
He sows and he shall not reap,
His life is a watch or a vision
Between a sleep and a sleep.

Of the two extremes of infidel thought—hope or despair, the first is arrived at by those who would fear not to be sanguine, who think out their theories halfway; the second is the logical conclusion of unbelief.

There is nothing more awful than the voice of infidelity, when, realizing the breadth and depth of the chaos, it tells its own horror with the force of experience and of desperation. This is the poetry of those whom a knowledge of the unstable position of their more hopeful brethren has driven to be pessimists. Such are the verses that make up the "*Poésies Philosophiques*," a little volume which strikingly expresses the feelings of one who has reached the utmost depth of infidelity; and as it bears a well-known name, and has been four times issued from the press, we may conclude that it is not only a forcible, but a popular expression of opinion. We ought to preface our examination of the book by stating that the poems were written under the lasting pressure of a great bereavement, by which the author's life suffered a sudden change from short-lived happiness to widowhood. The poetry, ranging over many subjects, is the vigorous and bitter outcome of the strongest feelings of an unusually strong mind, warped and marred by deeply-rooted and far-followed free thought. The voice comes to us, and to the hundreds to whom it has spoken, up from the great abyss of despair; but unconsciously, despite itself, from the first word to the last, it is a witness to the truth at which it scoffs.

The outcry of these Philosophical Poems is, Why does man exist? His short life is not worth its pain. Why this world? Why this endless entanglement of evil and of suffering? Christians talk of their God, and take refuge in believing. But no matter how it seems to solve life's mystery or to bring

peace, let us not take refuge in this delusion, in this "comforting lie." If there were a God, we would fain provoke him to shatter this earth into a thousand fragments; and so, by our suffering a more speedy annihilation, at least the generations of the future would be saved from existence.

Passing the poems separately before us, we shall be able to study more closely the view of life and of death which prompts this cry of helpless revolt. They that raise it have thrown away Faith, the one key of the world's great enigma; keeping their human sympathies quick and strong, they take away the supernatural from creation; what wonder is it if they are dissatisfied with the dregs that are left behind.

The first poem speaks of a shipwreck, where from sinking hands, the book is launched upon the waves. The last revives the same idea: all human kind are being engulfed in misery, and this is a drowning cry from the wreck, a cry battling with the waves, and rising above them "as if all hearts were gathered into one with all their despair." After this introduction the poems go on changing through many keys, but in the words of their composer, "for every melody henceforth there will be only daring verse and rebel cries." The next is a brief salutation of the "fair wandering star" of 1861, beautiful in versification, and full of thoughts of much poetic merit, but so embittered by the author's bias of feeling, that the grandeur of these few words becomes only the barren grandeur of a wide prospect marked by storm, flood, or fire with the track of death. All the rest has the same melancholy kind of merit. We admire, but with secret dread, standing where there has been scath and disaster—if, indeed, we can speak of admiring in any sense what is of its own nature false and monstrous. Certainly the writer has, in following these dire paths, the strength of feeling, and the passionate utterance of a poet. As a specimen of the French versification, we subjoin the address to the comet, a brief invocation of the stranger from the depths of heaven that came unexpectedly and went, and that perhaps, when it returns from its long voyage of ages, will look with pity upon an unpeopled earth, the scene of so much labour and anguish:

Bel astre voyageur, hôte qui nous arrives
Des profondeurs du ciel et qu'on n'attendait pas,
Où vas-tu ? Quel dessein pousse vers nous tes pas ?
Toi qui vogues au large en cette mer sans rives,
Sur ta route, aussi loin que ton regard atteint,
N'as-tu vu comme ici que douleurs et misères ?
Dans ces mondes épars, dis, avons-nous des frères ?
T'ont-ils chargé pour nous de leur salut lointain ?

Ah ! quand tu reviendras, peut-être de la terre
 L'homme aura disparu. Du fond de ce séjour
 Si son œil ne doit pas contempler ton retour,
 Si ce globe épuisé s'est éteint solitaire,
 Dans l'espace infini poursuivant ton chemin,
 Du moins jette au passage, astre errant et rapide,
 Un regard de pitié sur le théâtre vide
 De tant de maux soufferts et du labeur humain.

Les Malheureux is one of the most remarkable of the poems. The bold and strange idea of the dead refusing to rise at the last trumpet, is somewhat explained in a later passage, where a man declares, in the frenzy of passion, that the present is the only time : let the preachers of eternity not try to comfort him with that word : better that the tomb should close for ever on the form of clay that he loves, than that she should be given back to him in a future life full of other thoughts, burning with another fire. It is this idea that pervades *Les Malheureux*, not faith in a call to resurrection, but scorn, not only of the belief that resurrection shall be, but also of the possibility of happiness in any future existence. The trumpet has sounded. The pale dead come forth from half-open graves. But some remain motionless ; neither the trumpet summons, nor the angels will drag them out of their last refuge. They refuse to rise. What ! they cry, to see the skies and the light that once looked on our sorrows without pity ? Death was our only friend when all rejected us ; let us remain in his compassionate arms. They give a sad account of their journey upon earth before they found that one friend. It is the pessimist picture of the life that has no Beyond.

For us Youth came and passed with empty hands,
 Nor gave us joy in smiles or festal day ;
 Beneath our thirsting lips Love's springs ran dry,
 As Summer waters sink and waste away.
 Our path without a flower spread blasted by,
 And if perchance 'mid desolation drear
 Some loved support to aid our steps was near,
 We touched—it broke. Our hearts in direst need
 Where'er they leant found but a bending reed.
 A wound was ours where'er a wound might be,
 Chance fiercely struck with blows as sure as blind ;
 And toward the awful gulf of destiny
 Fate pushed us on, while close and swift behind,
 Watching as murderers watch the death-doomed prey,
 Dire pitiless Misfortune dogged our way.*

* Près de nous la Jeunesse a passé les mains vides,
 Sans nous avoir fêtés, sans nous avoir souri.

Perhaps, they urge, they may have a right to the eternal kingdom and its splendours, but they refuse it—

Yes, thou couldst give the wings of soaring flight,
Even yet to these crushed souls weighed down so low,
Couldst raise them up in love, and grace, and light,
Far, far above these spheres we mortals know,
And where the choirs rejoicing sing to thee ;
Couldst place us first and nearest 'neath thy gaze,
By angels crowned with immortality,
Clothed with transfigured glory's matchless blaze.
And thou couldst pierce us with youth's fiery glow,
Give back the withered hopes long earthward cast ;
But from our hearts the root of endless woe
Couldst thou pluck out—the memory of the past ?*

Tears would be in their eyes, bitter tears, tears without number. How, they protest, could they be called elect and happy, with that blinding veil ever before them ? Rather let them sleep an eternal slumber, forgetting they have ever been—

Dans un sommeil sans fin, ô puissance éternelle !
Laisse nous oublier que nous avons vécu.

It would have been marvellous had we found here anything approaching a true idea of the recompense of the just. How

Les sources de l'amour sous nos lèvres avides,
Comme une eau fugitive au printemps ont tari.
Dans nos sentiers brûlés pas une fleur ouverte.
Si, pour aider nos pas, quelque soutien chéri
Parfois s'offrait à nous sur la route déserte
Lorsque nous les touchions, nos appuis se brisaient ;
Tous devenait roseau quand nos cœurs s'y posaient.
Au gouffre que pour nous creusait la Destinée
Une invisible main nous poussait acharnée.
Comme un bourreau, craignant de nous voir échapper,
A nos côtés marchait le Malheur inflexible.
Nous portions une plaie à chaque endroit sensible,
Et l'avengle Hasard savait où nous frapper.

- * Nous le savons, tu peux donner encore des ailes
Aux âmes qui ployaient sous un fardeau trop lourd ;
Tu peux, lorsqu'il te plaît, loin des sphères mortelles
Les élever à toi dans la grâce et l'amour ;
Tu peux, parmi les chœurs qui chantent tes louanges,
A tes pieds, sous tes yeux nous mettre au premier rang,
Nous faire couronner par la main de tes anges,
Nous revêtir de gloire en nous transfigurant.
Tu peux nous pénétrer d'une vigueur nouvelle
Nous rendre le désir que nous avions perdu . . .
Oui, mais le Souvenir, cette ronce immortelle
Attachée à nos cœurs, l'en arracheras-tu ?

could error be escaped in speaking of the rewards of God, when there is no true idea of Himself, of the difference between His nature and that of His creatures: when there is entire ignorance of His justice and of His mercy, a knowledge of what Christians believe regarding His Omnipotence, but no breath or suggestion regarding His Love, except in such passages as we shall notice later, where the depth of the humiliation of Calvary, or the awfulness of the sacrifice scares away the infidel's belief, while the sad tale itself is almost fascinating his sympathy, and so the cross becomes, as the Apostle foretold, a stumbling-block—a folly. If the God of the Christians is misunderstood, at one time shown veiled under the figure of Jupiter, at another as a harsh executioner, again as a vague unformed idea, it is no matter for surprise that a wandering fancy should find a flaw in heavenly bliss, and declare it unworthy of acceptance. The whole system of faith, sorrow, and recompense is here misapprehended, but it is only a new proof of the truth of those words, which declare, that the heart of man cannot conceive these things. Reason stumbled in the dark, and seized some vague imagination of its own, taking it for what others held, and deriding it as unreasonable. There is a grander poem than *Les Malheureux* that vouchsafes to give the answer to it, the unearthly poetry of the Revelation that shall live and be read even until the calling of the wretched from their graves. It speaks of a multitude more than man could number, of all nations and tribes, of all peoples and tongues, white-robed, and bearing palms. "These are they who are come out of great tribulations, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb They shall neither hunger nor thirst, nor shall the sun fall on them nor any heat and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

"Eternity of man," we have in *l'Amour et la Mort*, "illusion ! chimera !—lie of love and human pride ! He had no yesterday ; he would have a to-morrow." And there follows much poetical raving against the Creator, who appears in these poems, not as a living being, but as the phantom deity of Christians ; while a corresponding amount of praise is lavished on man, who can dare to love in the face of annihilation. Then we have *Le Positivisme*, a short poem, so remarkable that it may best be placed entire before our readers, and left to their own criticism :

Beyond all human knowledge lies
The vast abyss Faith calls her own,
Dreaming that thence the darkness flies,
When in the depth she takes her throne.

Despotic Queen ! thy hour is come,
 From thine anointed realm begone,
 Nor for thy phantoms find a home.
 So close we the Unknown.

But yet shall he that conquered pay,
 Distraught and sad, the triumph's cost :
 Man wrought his ruin on that day,
 Dethroning thee his all was lost.
 Hope, refuge, rest are ours no more,
 Desires we banished all in vain
 Persistent wander back again
 And haunt that gulf's forbidden shore.*

Next under the thin veil of the legend of Prometheus, and the railing of the bound Titan against Jupiter, infidelity raises its voice against the Creator of man, the Being who made him and his misery :

Cet être déplorable, infirme, désarmé,
 Pour qui tout est danger, épouvante, torture,
 Qui dans le cercle de ses jours enfermé,
 Etouffe et se débat, se blesse et se lamente.

Prometheus declares that his vitals are eternally gnawed by the vulture, of the bitter thought that "nothing can take away the germs of human anguish which heaven's hatred has sown in flesh and blood." Why are these evils in the world ? he asks, "*Celui qui pouvait tout a voulu la douleur.*" And thereupon he swears against the Creator, judgment, vengeance, rejection by men, who shall be "delivered from Faith as from an evil dream."

This is not an adaption, but an entire change and marring of one of the most beautiful, most majestic, and most heart-moving of the old legends. The Prometheus here has robbed

* Il s'ouvre par delà toute science humaine
 Un vide dont la Foi fut prompte à s'emparer.
 De cet abîme obscur elle a fait son domaine ;
 En s'y précipitant elle a cru l'éclairer.
 Eh bien, nous t'expulsons de tes divins royaumes,
 Dominatrice ardente, et l'instant est venu :
 Tu ne vas plus savoir où loger tes fantômes ;
 Nous fermons l'Inconnu.

Mais ton triomphateur expira ta défaite.
 L'homme déjà se trouble et, vainqueur éperdu,
 Il se sent ruiné par sa propre conquête ;
 En te dépossédant nous avons tous perdu.
 Nous restons sans espoir, sans recours, sans asile,
 Tandis qu'obstinément le Désir qu'on exile
 Revient errer autour du gouffre défendu.

the fire of thought from heaven; but if this interpretation be followed out, it is not the outraged Deity who avenges the act, but the fire itself, which becomes the bane and punishment of the aggressor. So ends all correspondence with the legend. If man is bound, as in this case, to suffer the anguish of beholding a world without a God, it is his own doing; he himself has chained his own limbs to the rock, and summoned the vulture to prey upon the heart that was meant for peace and love, for the highest enjoyment of spiritual things, which it condemns itself now to know no more. Instead of raving against Jupiter, this Prometheus should curse that human pride which has made him revolt from all yoke, demanding knowledge to see at a glance the reason of all things, an attribute which does not belong to his finite mind. It is this pride which is for him at once avenger, and merciless vulture, and inextricable chains and unyielding rock.

Now, having seen the Pessimist's view of life, we are given a glimpse of his thoughts regarding the future. In the *Paroles d'un Amant* every page is scathed with the wretched hopelessness of the pagan's religion of life—it is well to live and love, and be fearless of the annihilation that is to come, since come it must. It is in this poem that the idea occurs which we have before quoted—the dead go down to the grave. Before that cold ruin, before that dust, speak not, menace not with the word *eternity*! In any possible happiness of after-life, human feeling would not remain. Therefore the motto of life is Live, love, and be no more.

It is scarcely necessary in the face of this hopeless creed to raise the Christian vision of eternity, of love in reality stronger than death, of the shortness of this cold twilight, and the length of the day of the just, when human nature, attaining its perfection, shall lose no human tenderness, no sympathetic thought, no mutual joy of kindred souls that made it beautiful on earth, but shall have all these enlarged a hundred-fold, so that it will be human nature still, human even as now, though impassible, immortal, inexhaustible in the vigour of youth; and incapable of sin as of sorrow, not by reason of any change in its nature, but because of the Vision that is in itself the strength of the elect. There is no need to dwell upon the contrast when we confront the hideous skeleton that is the Pessimist's symbol of the end, with the immortal spirit-like radiance of this belief. One is the creed of life, and the other of death; and that of life will conquer, lingering about the mind of man, whether in Christian reality or shadowy hope, no matter how loudly it may be cried in his ears by the few that all of him will die. He will hold in his innermost

consciousness, in some form, the creed of immortality, no matter how philosophers may tell him it is the self-flattery of human love and pride. A Strauss may lie stoically upon his death-bed, and face nothingness with a firm front, because the world's eyes are upon him; but from creation's dawn to its end, from the savage to the sophist, the united voice of man is the same for ever, *Non omnis moriar*.

We do not reflect upon these things for the sake of the oft-told argument, that the universal belief has a divine origin, and that a vast multitude of unassociating minds cannot conceive the same desire if it be an actual impossibility; but we are loath to think of the world with a last weight of misery upon its burden. Whatever men have to bear, out in the darkness beyond our reach, and weary of the striving of life, taken as a race, the last drop never was and never will be poured into their bitterness. They will never believe that all ends here, and that there is no hereafter.

Nevertheless, this *non-credo* finds advocates, who pride themselves upon not fearing to embrace a belief because it is terrible. If all sceptics would go on to this and not shake it in men's faces, but hold it themselves in actual truth, they would all have worked out their theories to a legitimate conclusion, and those theories once accepted, they would have shown themselves to have, for the rest, logical minds. But the bulk of men, who are shipwrecked in all else, hold with despairing anguish to the last plank of shattered truth, the hope of immortality. It is well. If a godless world is dark for the unhappy beings that have conjured its shadows up around them, there is one depth of darkness, one self-inflicted suffering that human instinct escapes.

Nature's Address to Man, and Man's Answer to Nature contain the doctrine of the eternally reconstructive elements of matter, and a vision of Nature's work, in which man, as he is now, is but the forerunner of a greater being; and the reply of man that the perfect being of her aspirations shall never be attained. Nature declares that, inebriated with his own pride, man believes he is her final work. But why should she stop in the joy of her labour, with all time, all space, before her? Art thou, she asks, my last limit, the end of my long toil—human atom—epitome of all wretchedness? No, she is striving to bring forth something greater while she converts matter "into form, and even life and thought." There is yet to come a liberator, who will draw aside her veil—the free sovereign being soaring in his own light. The rest, the multitude are nothing; they are only in her hands formed and destroyed—the clay she is to knead again and again.

More than three years after these lines were written, inspired by more gloomy thoughts, the poet answered for Man. Take back, then, this slime that for a few moments breathes under thy hand. Break the human mould. But thy ideal shall never be. It is only imagination—a bright phantom. I am thy son, real, living; ages ago I came forth from thy arms: *I bear upon my heart and upon my brow the seal of a high destiny.* Do I not know thee, Nature? do I not prove thy power, count up thy treasures, and thou art reflected in my intelligence? But in return I have only danger, strife, while I wear myself out with no defence and no refuge. Were my strength equal to my madness, I would tear that dumb hard bosom, and drag forth its mysteries. When Nature cries, I aspire! I answer,—I suffer, weak and bleeding; and that cry is taken up by all that breathe. The human race is “born but to endure agony”; therefore is Nature accursed, and may it perish, since out of a magnificent and boundless universe it has made nothing but a grave.

If we read aright between the lines of these poems, and see into their inner thought, they seem to be a denial of the possibility of what the optimists would call the regeneration of the race. Both poems are long, but their meaning is here condensed, giving the leading ideas in the words of the original. Even in this epitome it can be seen that the being who is to come is the same thing as the enlightened free generation who are looked for by a large school of thought; while man's denial of the possibility of progress to anything better, higher, or more peaceful, is an affirmation of the truth which we re-echo—You Nature-worshippers may dream of the Man of the Future, but he is the phantom of your own imagination, he will recede before you into eternity.

The poet declares that human misery is, and was, and ever will be, and desires the end of nature the creatrix, as Schopenhauer desired that the universe had never been. A remarkable depth of meaning attaches to one stanza of the reply. We cannot help feeling that the mind that conceived the two last lines thought them out truly, but misapprehended their full force, and that we and many more who read them interpret them aright. Speaking to Nature, Man protests—

Pourtant je suis ton fils aussi ; réel, vivace,
Je sortis de tes bras dès les siècles lointains ;
Je porte dans mon cœur, je porte sur ma face
Le signe empreint des hauts destins.

The three poems on War, which follow, were composed in memory of a nephew, Lieutenant Victor Fabrègue, who was

killed at Gravelotte. There is a grand personification of the Figure that rises in her anger with arm raised ; around her fire and blood, lines of flame, a moving mass of the living armed with death, and shaking at the sound of her voice. Then the metaphor is changed to a harvest, where Death cries out Well reaped ! The author can appreciate and praise the generous sacrifice of life, when it is spent in some great cause by "philosophers, men of learning, explorers, apostles, soldiers of the Ideal," but not when man becomes "the food of the cannon." Why, it is asked, should war be waged for a strip of territory, a shattered wall ? Why not wage war against ignorance and vice ? Without dying for the quarrels of nations, men can find plenty of opportunities for sacrificing life nobly. This is all very well—deserved execrations on "impious War," worthy sentiments, good human pity, wishes for universal peace, and battle with evil, which are shared by all men deserving to bear the name. But most men who have reflected are also convinced of the unhappy truth, that as long as man is man there will be national injustice, national greed, national wrong, revolt, and consequent self-defence. Therefore there will be war. What is the use of execrating what must be endured ? The days of treaties and councils for settling national affairs, in place of threats and hostilities, will never dawn on this world of rebellion and perversity. There is but one gate to peace laid open for the nations, and through that gate they will not pass. They refuse an arbitrator whose person is anointed, and whose voice rings from the eternal city above the clamour of men. And so long as men are so minded no central council, no wide-spread bond of republicanism, even if such a thing could be accomplished, would ever have authority to bend all to one yoke of international law, and to say that brief word Peace. Man is reaping the harvest of his sin. The same mind that rebels against faith and God rebels against his fellow-man. So it was, so it is, so it ever will be, till the trumpet-blast wakes the dead world after "wars and rumours of war." But from first to last man has himself to thank or condemn. It is the spirit of proud revolt that gradually in whole peoples broke up Christendom, where Rome was supreme arbitrator, and that in the individual rebels against faith, saying, I will not believe, I will know. My mind shall be ruled by its own reason ; no higher power shall speak.

The last words of Goethe, "*Mehr licht ! Mehr licht !*" appear at the head of some stanzas mourning over the hopeless darkness of "blind-born" man. Science, it is allowed,

has given a light, but religion none ; since to its invitation, "*J'éclairer ! Tu trouveras en moi le fin de tes tourments,*" the answer given is "*Tu mens !*" What can we say to those who stand in the face of that light, except that they have eyes and they do not see?

The Sphinx, the Cross, the Unknown One, and a Last Word, are a series of reflections on Pascal. Here is a whole tribute of poetic praise and rank infidelity brought to the feet of that extraordinary man, whose life, enslaved by Jansenism, was an existence entangled in mystery, a tale of a great baffled mistaken soul, a mass of marvel and contradiction. There was asceticism inspired by Jansenism, but most rigorously pursued ; high intentions rushing wrong in the dark ; war with the right and with the vanguard of the Church, and war with self, unremitting and unsparing enough for the penance of a saint. Here was the soil of a mighty soul that might have raised a harvest of profound thought for our generations, had it been ruled by the light ; but instead it brought forth most bitter fruit with a golden rind. "The first book written in prose, the epitome of all eloquence,"—such was one opinion pronounced upon the "*Provincial Letters,*" but the name of the man who gave it is enough to condemn both the eulogium and its object. It was Voltaire, the oracle of Ferney, who could not praise enough any strong blow aimed at the Church. It is no wonder that the infidel verses before us praise Pascal and blaspheme God ; for, if we look closely, there was a great resemblance in at least one point between Pascal's mind and that of the author of these poems. If there was anything specially remarkable in the youth and manhood of that great misguided man, it was the manner in which he was accustomed not to accept facts as he found them, but to demand why he found them so. He was more inclined to reason than to believe ; and doubtless the same bias ruled his mind in everything, from his experiments with quicksilver, and his reflections on science, up to his meditations on the dogmas of Christianity.

Pascal, in the first poem, is represented as believing that he can answer the riddle of the world, presented under the figure of the question of the Sphinx. But his confidence is a delusion, his answer a failure, and the monster falls upon him from the rock. He struggles, and allows himself to be torn in the strife, rather than lose "his treasure," Faith. Then comes "the Cross," the second part, where he takes refuge in religion. But where, asks the poet, is the brave athlete now ? We have here but a poor victim of hallucination. Would it not be better to have been devoured by the Sphinx than to

be crushed by the Cross? Next we have *l'Inconnue*, an allusion to the unnamed object of Pascal's love, who attracted him even in his austere life, ere he entered at Port Royal. Then comes the *Dernier mot*—"a last word, Pascal! I am going to make thy noble dust shudder with horror, but at least I shall have said what lay on my heart." It is true, the poem goes on, the hand of Pascal has shown the depths of human misery, its torture, its doubts. He felt its sorrows, but he thought he had only to unveil Faith, "monstrous and barren," to induce men to turn to her. But, exclaims the poet, we cannot help being human—but Christians we shall not be. Then the audacity of the infidel reaches its utmost pitch, while the dim shadow of the crucifix shines pleading through it, only to be cast away:—

When from his Golgotha your Christ
Comes bleeding 'neath his aureole,
With outstretched hands and words divine
To heal the sick and wounded soul,
And gives us sparkling waters pure,
Bright springs of hope and waves of light,
And shows our thrones that shall endure
Through the long ages' endless flight—
Tempter of heaven, he fain would buy
Our reason for his blood's dark flow.
We turn away. No voice can cry
Too oft, too loud, our answer—No!*

No—to the Cross! it goes on; the Cross which, standing in the path of Progress, has barred the way to true freedom: No! to that instrument of infamous torture, whereon we see not only the innocent expire, but justice also: No! to our salvation bought with blood: No! to the Victim despite his devotion: No! above all, to Him who enforced the sacrifice. Then, with a wild flight of anger,—which we prefer to call ignorant raving rather than blasphemy—the immolation of the Son is styled merciless and impious. Why do these voices

* Quand de son Golgotha, saignant sous l'aurole,
Ton Christ viendrait à nous, tendant ses bras sacrés,
Et quand il laisserait sa divine parole
Tomber pour les guérir en nos cœurs ulcérés;
Quand il ferait jaillir devant notre âme avide
Des sources d'espérance et des flots de clarté,
Et qu'il nous montrerait dans son beau ciel splendide
Nos trônes préparés de toute éternité,
Nous nous détournerions du Tentateur céleste
Qui nous offre son sang, mais veut notre raison.
Pour repousser l'échange inégal et funeste
Notre bouche jamais n'aurait assez de Non.

of darkness speak of things they do not understand? They think of the Almighty as a being like to our own finite selves. Sin and its outrage, God and His greatness, all knowledge of the Infinite, is as far from these minds as we and our weak sight are from those glorious suns that science shows us as the faintest farthest glimmerings, all but lost in the immensity that we cannot measure. Verily this was a bitter cup that the Victim of Calvary drank in His divine foreknowledge, when He saw man's pride and persistent ignorance cast back into the Face of God His own agony of humiliation, and His all but incredible excess of love.

Then this impious outcry reaches its height. "Fear," the infidel declares, "is conquered by indignation. But we shall strive to excite His fury. Who knows? We may find some insult that will provoke Him to madness, so that He will snatch this poor planet out of the universe, and dash it to a thousand pieces. Then can we, at least, exult in the shout of deliverance—man shall be no more—we are the last!"

Qui sait ! nous trouverons peut-être quelque injure
Qui l'irrite à ce point que, d'un bras forcené,
Il arrache des cieux notre planète obscure,
Et brise en mille éclats ce globe infortuné.
Notre audace du moins vous sauverait de naître,
Vous qui dormez encore au fond de l'avenir,
Et nous triompherions d'avoir, en cessant d'être,
Avec l'Humanité forcé Dieu d'en finir.
Oh ! quelle immense joie après tant de souffrance !
A travers les débris, par-dessus les charniers,
Pouvoir enfin jeter ce cri de délivrance :
Plus d'hommes sous le ciel, nous sommes les derniers !

Thus ends the last of the four poems collected under the name of Pascal—a name which suggested to the mind of the author a man who attempted to explain the problem of the world by Faith, and whose attempt is, according to this school of thought, to be condemned as folly, while the man for his genius and high desires and human sympathy—but probably most of all for his opposition to the Holy See—is to be praised. It is entirely left out of account that this great thinker did not face the problem of human life, labour, and misery with the pure faith whose yoke is sweet and whose burden light; but that he would fain have dragged man upward through thorns and by a false path too narrow for his feet. The poet, in that praise of the man and in that raving against the Maker in whom he believed, is moved by admiration of the natural gifts of Pascal, and sorrow that he should have believed at all. We

share that sorrow, but in a far different sense. What is to be more regretted than that so great a soul should have believed as he did, according to its own light, what is more sad than to witness the slavery of a strong mind to its own errors, the frustration of the high designs of heaven by those very gifts of intellect which might have won the everlasting praise of the Church, instead of the passing plaudits of the Gallican, the Liberal, and the Infidel?

Now comes the epilogue of the "*Poésies Philosophiques*"—*Le Cri*. It opens with a description of a shipwreck where a drowning voice sends up to heaven a despairing, heart-rending cry, and the sea-birds shudder with horror, and the winds themselves for a moment stand still. Like that voyager, says the poet, I am about to disappear beneath the waves; but the sea is deeper than an earthly sea, and the wreck is greater and more disastrous. It is the human race that is sinking. It struggles in vain with the darkness. Fear is on the deck, and Despair and Woe; and Fate sits darkly at the helm, steering for the rocks. While the rest are silent, it goes on, my voice pours out anathemas against heaven. Let my wild cry be so strong that it shall startle those same deaf heavens. "Ah! it is a sacred voice, like all voices of agony. In the moment of death it accuses, it protests. So be it! I have cast upward this cry of anguish and of infinite horror—let me sink!" The same idea under the form of a universal deluge close at hand is carried out in the last poem of all, which is dedicated to Victor Hugo, and which only appears in the most recent edition. Such is the end of the "*Poésies Philosophiques*."

Some centuries ago there was a story told to an Eastern audience, some of whom heard, and some refused to hear. It was the history of a man who, plunged for ever, by his own deeds, into unendurable sufferings, asked that a messenger might go back to his brethren, "that he might testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torments." This, too, is a voice from the dead. It is a warning from the lowest deep of infidelity, from what might be fittingly called the hell of unbelief, for such it would be, only that it need not be eternal, for while there is life there is hope. We have heard the voice. While it meant to deny the truth, it became its advocate. Who can listen to it, and not be scared from the edge of the gulf? Who could fail to recognize in every outburst of impious anger or despairing grief the warning of the dead to the living?

We have listened. We know some of the secrets of the soul-consuming bitterness that is felt down there in the depths. What then are the paths to this abyss? Only one

broad path, which, at the beginning, is divided and scarcely marked, starting from many points, where all men pass—a path ill-defined that crosses and re-crosses the places beloved of proud intellects and self-dependent souls. It is doubt—doubt with its little beginnings, its wide freedom, its fascinating bravery striking out boldly to explore the lands where only strong wise feet may tread. And from doubt, the sceptic glides into the creed of matter and chance, and alluring optimism, and goes down, if at this point he is logical and not self-flattering, down with fearless steps into the bottomless pit, where all is darkness and despair. That abyss is the pessimism to which many great thinkers have arrived after they have discarded Faith; and thither the whole mass of infidelity would go as straight as a stone to the earth, if only every mind that believed in a godless world were clear enough to see what a godless world means.

The wonder is that a man who has become a free-thinker can enjoy any part of life, unless in the same inexplicable manner as that in which the condemned to death may enjoy their last food. The wonder above all is, that he can look upon the faces he loves, feeling that he may cherish them as he will, but their doom is nothingness. Would life, or human hope be worth having, or human energy be worth keeping, if the existence of the best, the bravest, the most beloved was that of a breaking bubble? Let any thinking man reflect for five minutes upon the world become a place where the pleasures of the hour were all that could be snatched from time; let him try to picture it universally in that state after even one century, and he will find in his imagination no blackness deep enough to represent the low level to which the bulk of this corrupt race would have fallen. Here are four lines of an English infidel poet, which, if men believed them and realized their state, might well make them declare life was not worth its striving and pain, and would render reasonable the wish that the world had never been:—

We are baffled and caught in the current, and bruised upon edges of shoals;
As weeds or as reeds in the torrent of things are the wind-shaken souls.
Spirit by spirit goes under, a foam-bell's bubble of breath,
That blows, and opens in sunder, and blurs not the mirror of death.

Against this dismal view of life, faith appeals to us through our reason and the innate instincts of the heart. There is a beautiful expression of the persuasiveness of the appeal in the famous poem, "*In Memoriam*," which may be taken as a popular description of the unconquerable yearnings of the soul for immortality. The voice of faith in the unseen world

to come runs through it all, now almost failing, hushed by doubt, then ringing out clear and strong, till in the end it closes like a psalm of joy. Let us oppose as the reply to the godless views of the writer of the lines given above, the heart's answer from "In Memoriam":—

My own dim life should teach me this,
That life shall live for evermore,
Else earth is darkness at the core,
And dust and ashes all that is
'Twere best at once to sink to peace,
Like birds the charming serpent draws,
To drop head-foremost in the jaws
Of vacant darkness and to cease.

Were this all, says truly the poet of the heart's instinct, man would be a monster, a dream, a discord; the dragons of the primeval slime were "mellow music" matched with him.

But besides appealing to the heart and the inward consciousness, Faith appeals on other grounds to the reason. Unfortunately, what people are certain to consider proof enough to obtain their assent to a newly-discovered law of science, is not considered sufficient even to provoke further inquiry when the matter is religion. Yet there it stands, not a new law, but the old revelation. Because it is invisible it is denied, because of its very allurements it is suspected as a snare. There it stands confronting the sphinx of the world, the only one that knows the answer to the riddle of the mystery of life. That similitude was well chosen in the "*Poésies Philosophiques*." We may truly regard the hidden secret of our being as the question of the sphinx of these days. Whoever cannot answer it is torn to pieces, though he may put forward the most specious arguments for his own reply. To every one that passes along the way Faith can whisper the answer to the mystery; but how many in doubt and suspicion refuse it, preferring to make out an answer for themselves.

Assuredly there is something in this state of existence which baffles all merely human inquiry. There are a thousand discords everywhere; the fragments of countless broken lives; a vast weight of suffering indiscriminately dealt by chance and change, or heaped by men upon each other; an unknown force called life, which science fails to analyze, which can be blotted out in a moment but never restored; another bodiless thing called death, which is but the blotting out of life, and which, as far as mortal sight can penetrate, is the end of everything, the annihilation in a moment of beings that had been capable of thought, reason, the noblest deeds and

the highest aspirations. But then comes Faith and explains all as clearly as experience can tell to childhood the meaning and reason of the things that set its wide young eyes wondering. Faith comes, and the unceasing discord is changed into a sublime harmony, making "life, death, and the great forever one grand sweet song." Faith comes and gathers together the fragments of the broken lives, and shows that, had they been whole and seemly in our sight, they would have been less beautiful than these sorrow-shattered wrecks. Faith comes and lays bare the loving providence and the immutable wisdom that we called chance and change; and pointing to the burthen of human woe in all its dire diversity and varying degree, tells us that the one sorrow is sin, that these transitory fruits of bitterness are of men's-own sowing, and that this is not the end—the day will come when the empty measures of the afflicted just will be filled up with good things shaken together and running over. Faith comes and whispers the word Immortality! "That which you called life is but transition; and that which you called death is life." And if we see suffering and evil at times preponderate over the good, and if we grow weary, judging, despite ourselves, with a human judgment, still Faith reminds us that it is in the other world, and not in this, that justice being accomplished, will be unveiled before all. Time is but the beginning of what we witness around us; eternity is yet to come. We are looking on an unfinished work. How can we expect to understand, how can we venture to judge all its minute detail, when the completion is yet to be given by the same Wisdom that began it.

Now there rises another question. Is life—life even on its surface—as black as some hands can paint it? We unhesitatingly answer, No. Doubtless an infidel world would be from pole to pole a very lazar-house of woe, but the world is not that; and those sceptics who, without descending to pessimism, represent it, as many do, to be full of misery and darkness, are describing falsely even from their own point of view. There is everywhere under the confused surface, thanks to man's tenacious hold of some good, and some portions of the truth, an under-stratum of happiness, and worth, and beauty, and goodness, and we see it every day when chance winds blow aside the troubled dust of that more noticeable surface. But it is the fashion to speak of the misery of the world, and in some quarters, if a poet wants to make his verses heard, he has only to cry out loud and be grief-stricken and despairing. To quote two examples from well-known names—did not the gloomy monologue in "*Childe Harold's*

Pilgrimage " make it doubly interesting to a thousand minds who could find nothing nearer home on which to spend their sympathy? And beside Shelley's musical verse and boldness of infidelity, when there was less of it flaunted abroad than now, did not his melancholy moods go far to win admiration, and to set him apart from other men? Few will deny that apt saying of his, that—

Sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought ;

but the sadness which is welcomed, because it softens the heart with a sympathy that sanctifies its pleasure, is very different from the morbid sadness that is far too often sung. What was gained by those two men, already named, filling their verse with lamentations centred in themselves, merely because sorrow, poetically expressed, is easy to write, and almost certain to win its way better than brighter strains? But still more, where is the sense or advantage that sanctions the publication of the unnamed grief, the self-dissatisfaction and the hatred of life that some poets of our own time never tire of mingling with their verse? If it was real sorrow, nobly and honestly expressed, it would be not only pardonable, but praiseworthy. Such was the tribute to friendship which was offered of late years on a grave, a veritable *in memoriam* wreath of immortelles marked with the cross of hope. But there is another kind of sorrow which has no cause but in some secret workings of a vitiated or restless mind. The name of chagrin fits it best, only that expresses its dissatisfied spirit, without its vastness or its blackness. Half—nine-tenths of the men, who pour out this melancholy madness in the ears of the public, do not feel it themselves. It is grandly poetic in their eyes, and, alas! in the eyes of their admirers, to be an outraged gifted being, torn by the sight of a world of anguish. The poet himself revels in it, and perhaps his readers know, after a while, that they need not waste much sympathy on him, despite all his continued wailing out in print with rebellious accents. Such verse-writing, no matter whose it may be, is not worth the paper it is on. It is the provoking of others to feel and revolt against woes the writer himself does not feel, and knows to be exaggeration and poetic capital. It is deception, and should be condemned as a fraud in art, a manifest injustice to those who are ensnared by bold words and melodious rhythm. For the reader can gain no good and may receive much harm from these pictures of a rebellious, crushed mind, and a miserable world; the latter, perhaps, enjoyed by the poet himself only too well.

We have drawn a broad distinction here between truth and

deception, between real grief which forces itself out upon man's noblest highway of thought—poetry; and morbid repining, which is cherished only because it looks well in verse. The same difference lies between an honest pessimist's despairing description of the world, and a similar description from men who live at their ease, but would be glad to raise man against his Maker by persuading him that there is nothing but evil and tears from the cradle to the grave. For untruth and malice the latter school of poetry cannot be sufficiently hated. As for the utterances of the pessimists, we can condemn them for the falseness of their views, but not for deliberate fraud on the unthinking, if we give them credit for holding to the full the opinions they set forth. But there is another ground upon which we would question the right of this poetry to see the light of day. What is its use? Even supposing for a moment that the world was plunged in that abyss of wretchedness, would anything in these dismal death-chants go towards making one heart lighter, or one life better? Those who have no belief in the possible improvement of man's condition cannot hope to do the most trifling good by such publications as the "*Poésies Philosophiques*." Are the unhappy better for being exasperated? Is not all this wild verse-writing only done for the pleasure of fame, perhaps dearly bought, and not in accordance with the much-vaunted love of humanity? Even weighing this deep-dyed infidelity according to its effect on prosperity and order, it is too clear for argument that it can further neither. What then is the *raison d'être* of pessimistic poetry? More probably self-satisfaction than sympathy with the rest of mankind.

Before opening the volume of the "*Poésies Philosophiques*" we foretold that allowance would have to be made for some of its contents, because it was written under the pressure of grief. With that grief we sympathize, as with all sorrow that is human, and, closing the book, we would have it made clear that our condemnation of morbid sadness is not meant for this, of which we know nothing, but is dealt at a wide weedy growth of poetry much nearer home, some of it bearing well-known names, and the rest practically anonymous—for the little follow the great in the fashion of melancholy raving as in all others.

Lastly, let us give a word of praise to that true poetry of sorrow which is also the poetry of Faith. It is abundant, it must always be, for tears are man's heritage during this his sowing-time; it is only at the hour of the heavenward harvest that they are dried. And as the poet finds relief for his thoughts in moulding them into that form of language that comes naturally to him with his strongest feelings, the sincere

outpouring of man's secrets of woe must till the end be told again and again in verse. If it be spontaneous, it will not be unworthy of his grief, however sacred that may be. But this is a grief far different from that which makes the mind of the infidel see nothing but universal blackness in his hour of bereavement and frustrated hope. It is the grief of those that mourn, not for the dead in eternal death, but for the parted who, beyond the thin veil of the unseen world, still live and love. Such poetry is a grand protest against the unbeliever's thankless despair, since it is the voice of the soul fresh from the touch of Death that passed by, and feeling therefrom more than ever the undying strength of its own immortality. Under the pressure of the sorrow that no human life escapes, the verse of the infidel is the raising of a weak but angry arm against the God in whom it believes not, and whom it names but to blaspheme: the poetry of the soul that rests in Faith, is the uplifting of prayerful hands and the setting heavenward of a face that has known tears, but knows better far the joy of thanksgiving and the peace of assured hope.

ART. IV.—CHRISTIAN CHARITY AND POLITICAL ECONOMY.—PART I.

De la Richesse dans les Sociétés Chrétiennes. Par CHARLES PERIN. 2^e éd. 1868.

La Réforme Sociale en France. Par F. LE PLAY. 5^e éd. 1864.

La Charité Chrétienne et ses Œuvres. Par l'Évêque d'ORLÉANS. 3^e éd. 1864.

The Proletariat on a False Scent. By W. R. GREG. Reprinted in *Mistaken Aims of the Artisan Class.* 1876.

FUTURE historians of science will have to record a long list of false and mischievous doctrines which have sheltered themselves under the imposing name of Political Economy. One group of these errors, those namely regarding the relief of the poor, we now propose to examine, and to show how, if by Christian Charity is meant charity according to the principles of the Catholic Church, and if by Political Economy is meant a body, not of assumptions, but of demonstrated truths as to man in his relation to material goods, then there is not,

as alleged, any opposition between Christian Charity and Political Economy. We shall try also to show the evils of poor relief carried on in defiance of Christian principles. But before entering upon the task of criticism and refutation, it will be well, if indeed it is not rather necessary, to set forth what seems the true theory of charity, in order that, having once gained light as to what really can cause and really can remedy the misery of the lower classes, we may see clearly those false causes and false remedies which can only mislead those who are in the dark. We will therefore begin with some account of the true causes of misery and the fitting action of charity, and afterwards examine the errors as to charity, notably the not unfrequent charge that almsgiving promotes idleness and improvidence, ruins the sense of duty between parents and children, and is the cause of the misery it professes to relieve. One more preliminary remark should be made,—an explanation, namely, of certain terms. Poverty may be taken to express the condition of those whose revenue will not suffice to enable them, though they be frugal and industrious, to obtain more than what is necessary for decent existence in the lowest class of society. The term indigence or destitution implies a revenue falling below this point, and the term misery may be taken to mean the physical and moral results of this deficiency. When misery is the normal and hereditary condition of a considerable portion of the population, it can be called pauperism.*

Now we will try to give in outline the causes of misery, which we will arrange under numbered heads for convenience of reference, asking at the same time indulgence if our list be defective both in completeness and logical arrangement, for which faults the complication of the subject must plead excuse. In this list of heads we follow M. Périn ("De la Richesse," book vi. ch. iv. v. vi. vii.), though with considerable modifications, and we have borrowed also from M. Le Play's chapter on Pauperism ("La Réforme Sociale," ch. xlix.), and from the interesting excursus on casual labour in Mr. Henry Mayhew's "London Labour and London Poor" (vol. ii. p. 279, sq., edition of 1861).

The *first* head comprises all accidents affecting masses; such as pestilence, murrain, drought, flood, earthquake, hurricane, conflagration, invasion of locusts, blight, and so forth; and needs no further explanation. Let the Indian famine serve here as an obvious example!

* Cf. Corbière, "Economie Sociale," ii. p. 325, sq.; Périn, "De la Richesse," book vi. ch. i.

The *second* head comprises all injuries affecting masses, such as the depredations of pirates, or of those engaged in the slave-trade, and above all, of hostile armies. The condition of France during the English wars in the later Middle Ages is a classical instance of misery due to this head.

The *third* head comprises the accidents affecting individuals; such as illness, insanity, old age, or death; for example, when the bread-winners of a large family are cut off, and the very young or very old left helpless; or when some of the disasters named under the first head fall only upon one or a few individuals, as when all the live stock of a peasant farmer perish.

The *fourth* head comprises injuries affecting individuals; as unjust lawsuits, betrayal of trust, bankruptcy of debtors, desertion of helpless children by parents, neglect of aged parents by children, desertion of wives by husbands, and the widespread class of injuries that fall under fraud and usury, taking advantage of the distress or ignorance or folly or passion of others, as French usurers trade on the passion of the peasants for land, and, receiving more annual interest than the annual produce of the land, lead their victims to certain ruin.*

The *fifth* and *sixth* heads are political, and are respectively oppressive taxation and oppressive military service. Examples of the effect of the one may be seen in the later Roman empire, in France under Louis XIV., and in modern Turkey; of the other, in the Roman republic from the time of the second Punic war, where the frequent military service was one of the main causes of the ruin of the smaller Roman farmers.

The *seventh* head requires more explanation, and could not exist where the means of production were so equally distributed that no one possessed more than could be conveniently worked by himself and his family. But when a single individual owns more than this, and the view prevails that a man may do what he likes with his own, an opposition may arise between public and private interest. An illustration will make this clear. Let us imagine a district belonging to 100 small owners, supporting themselves from their land and employing no hired labourers. Let their annual revenue, deducting expenses, be £50 each. In this district the State can show 100 families gaining an aggregate net revenue of £5,000. Next let us suppose one of these small farmers is made the absolute owner of the whole district, and the others become his tenants or labourers or slaves. Now as long as the 99 families, thus brought into subjection to him, live on the land, he can only

* For details on this and similar modes of usury see Le Play, "*Ouvriers Européens*," p. 265.

get from them for himself the difference between the amount they produce and the share of it needed for their support, let us say £10 in each case. Here £990 is taken from their aggregate revenue and added to his, making it £1,040; but though the distribution of revenue among the inhabitants of the district has been changed, the aggregate revenue and the number of inhabitants remain the same. The owner however may be tempted in two ways to lessen both. He may prefer pleasure and hunting-grounds to revenue, and may clear a large portion of the district to make room for gardens and lakes, for deer or wildfowl. Or he may prefer a larger revenue, though ill-gotten, to a smaller revenue, though well-gotten, and may adopt a mode of production (as rearing live stock instead of raising corn) which may indeed yield from a given area a smaller return, but requires the employment of a more than proportionately smaller number of workmen. In the case we have supposed above, the owner may turn away 50 of the families, and by substituting pasture for tillage, may get from the labour of the remaining 49 more than he got before from the labour of the 99,—let us say £80 from each family instead of £10. His revenue will rise from £1,040 to £1,520 (an addition of £480), but the aggregate revenue of the tenants or labourers sinks from £3,960 to £1,960 (a diminution of £2,000). Thus the total revenue raised from the district sinks from £5,000 to £3,480, and the number of families from 100 to 50; and the State has to lament a decline of both wealth and population. This theoretical possibility, well enough recognized by Mr. Mill in his "Political Economy" (bk. i. ch. vi. § 2, p. 118-119; ch. ix. § 1, p. 168, sixth edition), has many times been mournfully illustrated in practice; witness ancient Greece and Italy, and England under the Tudors, and the Roman Campagna since the Middle Ages, and the Scottish highlands in the early years of this century, and Ireland (who can count this perhaps as the last and greatest of her wrongs) since the famine 30 years ago. We need not dilate on the misery of the superseded peasantry, but have here only to mark how fruitful a cause of misery such a supersession may be, and to suggest to our good countrymen who indignantly ask why the English gaols and workhouses are filled with a degraded and drunken set of Irish, that perhaps the race and religion of these Irish do not afford an entirely adequate or satisfactory explanation of the phenomenon.

Let this much suffice as to the seventh head of the causes of misery. The *eighth* is over-population, or rather, considering the present condition of the world, congestion of population. An exaggerated importance has, as M. Périn notices

("Richesse," vol. ii. pp. 137-138), been attached to simple increase of numbers, and existing misery has been attributed mainly to the pressure of population on subsistence. Now it is perfectly true and demonstrable that any *given area* will only support a certain number of inhabitants, and that *after a certain point* all extra produce will, *if no improvement occurs in the mode of production*, be obtained with more than proportionate extra toil, so that at last each fresh pair of hands will not win enough to satisfy each fresh mouth. But this abstract and well-guarded proposition is very different from such a statement as that the existing misery of—say England and France—is due to over-population. An accurate comparison the relative progression of population, wealth, and misery during the hundred years from 1750 to 1850 would we think in both countries show the untenableness of such a view; and in our opinion few statements could be more false or mischievous than that of a great legal officer in a recent trial, when he said: "Mr. Malthus started a theory . . . now an irrefragable truth, that population has a tendency to increase faster than the means of subsistence, and that, consequently, there must be a vast number of persons upon whom poverty presses sadly and heavily" ("Times" Report, 22nd June, 1877). True enough in certain cases there is undoubted suffering from congestion of population, notably among peasantry where hereditary customs, or joint ownership, or the nature of the district (as a mountain valley) hinder improvements in the mode of cultivation. In Russia the evil is promptly met by the grant of crown lands for colonization,* but in Würtemberg and Flanders, and in parts of France and Switzerland, the land, with the increase of population or rather of landowners, has been disastrously subdivided.† But the remedy for such congestion is not to be sought in limitations to population, which imply immorality, such as the odious limitation of births which is the disgrace and political weakness of modern France, but in better laws of succession to property and of the ownership of land; in the introduction of agricultural improvements, and, if needful, in the fit organization of home or foreign colonization. There can also no doubt be a temporary disproportion between subsistence and population due to those wide-spreading accidents or injuries, such as drought or war, already spoken of (under the first and second heads of the causes of misery); or, again, due to those

* See "Report on Poor Laws in Foreign Countries. Accounts and Papers, 1875," vol. lxx. p. 35, sq.

† See Roscher, "Ackerbau," § 142, especially notes 9 and 10; § 143, especially notes 2 and 4.

industrial crises, of which we are soon going to speak (as the ninth head). But in such cases it is not the increase of population, but the decrease of the means of subsistence, that causes the evil, which can occur in a thinly as well as in a thickly-peopled land. Also, as we shall see when we notice the special calamities or technical changes that may befall a special trade (tenth and eleventh heads), there can be too many workmen in a given trade in a given locality. But here again we cannot say that over-population is the cause, as though the evil had been brought on by "reckless multiplication." We must say rather that other causes at work have resulted in the previous members of a given trade in a given locality being no longer able to find support. Lastly, as we shall see, there can be terrible misery and creation of "surplus hands" by overwork and by the employment of women and children (twelfth and thirteenth heads). But this evil is due to a shameful oppression of the weak by the strong, and not to the members of the lower classes being redundant; and here the remedy is mainly in the rich doing their duty, and not any more than in the other cases in artificial limitations to population, which, if they were a remedy, would be worse than the disease; and in reality are no remedy, since (*inter alia*) they would foster two of the most potent causes of misery (to be discussed as the fourteenth and sixteenth heads), namely neglect or oppression by employers and landlords, and vice among the lower classes themselves.

Let us now look at the *ninth* head, namely those wide-spread crises which are so disastrous a characteristic of modern industry, and on which a few words of explanation are needed because of the common, though mistaken, notion that they are caused by lack of currency, and are to be cured by the importation of gold or issues of paper. It will, perhaps, be enough to explain that the main feature of such crises as those of 1857 and 1866 in England and of 1873 in Germany and the United States, is the settling who is to bear the loss of a vast *previous* diminution of wealth. This diminution has two immediate causes. First, the destruction of wealth in useless undertakings, as barren mines sunk, railways made in deserts or backwoods, bridges built where there is no traffic, factories with costly machinery where there is no trade, vast stores of materials collected that are not wanted, and so forth, the result of wild speculation and feverish eagerness for wealth. So in Prussia, whereas in some 80 years up to 1870 only 300 joint-stock companies had been established, no less than 780 were established in the two years 1871 and 1872, of which the greater part perished in the crisis of 1873 ("Fraser's Magazine,"

Jan., 1877). So in the United States, according to a calculation in the "Times" (3rd Feb., 1876) there had been up to about that time some £97,000,000 invested by the Americans themselves and £46,000,000 borrowed from abroad for railways that could not pay their way, or had to be reconstructed at a heavy sacrifice. The second cause of the diminution of wealth is the reckless consumption by the speculating communities during the period preceding the crash. So in America, before the great crisis of 1873, it is related that at one entertainment £800 was spent on the pastry alone. Nor is the extravagance confined to the rich, but extends to the lower classes, who are tempted to excess by the sudden rise of wages. Professor Bonamy Price, in his work on Currency and Banking (p. 135, seq.), has justly emphasized the diminution of wealth before the crisis comes,* and he marks the delusive character of the apparent prosperity in that previous time, and how, if a nation eat and drink up all its property in one year, there would seem to be gigantic well-being for that one year; but in the next, starvation! The results of these crises on the poor are well known and terrible, and can be compared to the periodical famines that desolate certain ruder communities. Thousands are thrown out of work through no fault of their own, and the savings of years may have to be sacrificed to secure not comfort but bare existence. Mr. Horace White, in the "Fortnightly Review," June, 1876, p. 810, speaks of the extreme suffering through periodical crises falling on those who are least responsible, the labouring poor; and of England in 1816 and 1825, and America in 1837 and 1857 he says: "All that man could do had been done to turn them shelterless and penniless into the street." In the United States since the crisis of 1873 the sharpest suffering has prevailed among the working classes, and many of our readers will remember the pitiable distress in the East end of London after the crisis of 1866, and the more pitiable apology for it by the "Times" in a passage which Mr. Matthew Arnold has held up to deserved ridicule:† "The East End is the most commercial, the most industrial, the most fluctuating region of the metropolis. It is always the first to suffer; for it is the creature of prosperity, and falls to the ground the instant there is no wind to bear it up. The whole of that region is covered with huge docks, shipyards, manufactories, and a wilderness of small houses, all full of life and happiness [?] in brisk times, but in dull times withered and

* How in agriculture there can be crises from similar causes, see Roscher, "Ackerbau," § 137.

† "Culture and Anarchy," p. 237 (2nd edit., p. 212). The italics and note of interrogation are our own.

lifeless, like the deserts we read of in the East. Now their brief spring is over. There is *no one to blame* for this; it is the result of Nature's simplest laws." Similarly, when the assassin shoots his victim, there is no one to blame; it is the result of Nature's simplest laws that a bullet impelled with a certain force in a certain direction will penetrate the vital organs and cause death. Let us not, however, lose further time over such folly, but rather point out, first, how the sufferings of the time of collapse are intensified by the working classes having grown accustomed during the time of inflation to comforts they could really ill afford; and secondly, how, besides their directly disastrous effect, these periodical crises, by making the future uncertain, so that no industry and no parsimony can secure a peaceful old age, have a like effect to periodical earthquakes or pestilence, and encourage reckless improvidence.

As the *tenth* head of causes of misery we place the crises which occur in some special industry, whether from rash speculations confined to the particular trade, or to other causes, such as the change of fashion or stoppage of supply (as in the cotton famine in 1861), or supplanting of one district or country by another, as of the clothiers of the West of England by those of Yorkshire, or of the Indian weavers by Lancashire factories. In a special crisis due to this last-named cause the rest of the community may gain the advantage of better or cheaper goods, but this does not remove the misery of the sufferers.

The *eleventh* head can be called technical transformation, which in an age of great advance in the physical sciences, may be a constant source of misery. New mechanical or chemical processes may enable the same produce to be obtained not merely with less labour but with unskilled instead of skilled labour, and may not merely throw numbers out of employment but render useless the skill and knowledge acquired by a long and expensive apprenticeship. A classical instance of the effects of machinery may be found in the evidence of a Mr. Nasmith before the Trades Unions Commission (cited by Mr. Brassey, "Work and Wages," p. 130): "The great feature of our modern mechanical improvements has been the introduction of self-acting tools. All that a mechanic has to do, and which any lad is able to do, is, not to labour, but to watch the beautiful functions of the machine. All that class of men who depended upon mere dexterity *are set aside altogether*. I had four boys to one mechanic. By these mechanical contrivances I reduced the number of men in my employ, 1,500 hands, fully one half. The result was that *my profits were much increased*." A magnificent result indeed,

but—but how fared it with the 750 hands who were set aside altogether? Many are the instances of misery due to such technical transformation, as of the hand-loom weavers gradually ruined by the introduction of the power-loom; or the Nottingham hosiers ruined by the introduction of labour-saving frames, and whose misery became widely known through the infamous Act against them, making it death to break these frames, and by Lord Byron's noble speech in their defence.* Even those economists who most strongly urge the ultimate compensation to the workmen through the increased wealth resulting from the technical improvement, can hardly deny the evident misery of the period of transition. We think it can be shown that this compensation, though likely, is by no means certain; and at any rate the perpetual succession of technical changes prolongs indefinitely the unhappy period of transition.

The *twelfth* head is overwork, whether the excess be in duration or intensity, or both. Overwork is injurious to the workman in different ways. The work may be too much absolutely, that is, either exceeding what is good for health, and thus inducing disease and premature old age, or exceeding what is good for morality, by leaving no time for culture, religion, and rational amusements, and thus driving the workmen to make the most of their brief respite from toil by plunging into sensual indulgence. Or the work may be too much relatively, that is, in regard to the state of the market for the given product, and may consequently throw out of work a corresponding number of other workmen. Our own country has afforded many terrible examples of "surplus workmen" being thus generated by the overwork of others, notably among the so-called slop-workers of the East End of London. By reductions of wages men have been induced to work harder or longer in order to gain the same income as before; and by the consequent increase of (what is called) the supply of labour have caused a further decline in wages, till the mournful limits of the minimum subsistence and maximum toil allowed by nature have been reached, and multitudes are at the same time without any work or wages at all.

Analogous effects are produced by the employment of women and children, which we will make a *thirteenth* head. The same melancholy circle has been witnessed of the father of the family compelled to employ his wife and children to supplement his reduced earnings, and by the very increase of working power enabling a further reduction of the worker's earnings, till at

* See Brentano, "*Arbeitergilden*," vol. ii. p. 189.

last the whole family gain no more than what the father once gained alone.

For the *fourteenth* head, which we should say was for modern Europe the most important of all, we can think of no title more accurate or compendious than the neglect or oppression of their dependents by employers and landowners. On this point there are current notions based on so grave a disregard of reason and facts, that we must speak somewhat at length. Instead of landowners and employers looking on themselves as responsible for the physical and moral well-being of their tenants and workmen, and filling an office of the gravest importance and dignity both from the religious and political point of view; instead of remembering that the accumulation of the means of production—lands, factories, mines, ships—in the hands of a few owners is only justifiable and tolerable on the understanding that such owners, or at least the great mass of them, act as fathers and guardians to the multitudes under them, without whose labour those lands and factories would be useless; instead of these views, they held that their obligations ended with paying or doing what they had legally contracted to pay or do; that the property was their own to do with as they liked; that their farms should be let to those tenants who would pay the highest rent; that those workmen should be employed who would work most for least wages; that they were no more bound to look after the sick or aged who had worked for them in health and youth, than to build an asylum for their worn-out machinery; that they were not their brother's keeper, nor bound, nay, not entitled to pry into the moral life of their fellow-citizens; that civilization had made an end of feudal tyranny; that all men were free and equal, their tenants not bound to the soil, their workmen at liberty to quit their service and work for any other master, or set up for themselves; that, in short, it was a free country, and that they were sincerely thankful for this happy freedom, which enabled them to grow rich so quickly and enjoy their riches so securely. The concrete application of this theory can be seen written in dreadful characters upon the face of Western Europe. To this theory is due in great part that overwork and that employment of women and children already mentioned as causes of misery; also the employment of women and children without protection against cruelty or immorality, disregard of the health of the workers in unhealthy employments and of their safety in dangerous employments. The record of these evils in England may be found in the Reports of Royal Commissions and of Factory Inspectors; and the Factory Laws themselves, so lengthy and detailed, tell how

employers have neglected their duty. But there are other results of the application of this theory which the law has not checked and has in some cases fostered ; undue increase of apprentices, employing, e.g., fresh apprentices when many grown men in the trade are out of work ; importation of workmen from distant parts, with or without deceit or violence, as of the Irish once to London, and of Hindoos and Polyne-sians to certain colonies ; employment of middlemen, so as to save trouble and the personal odium of oppression, as the "sweater" employed by the cheap outfitting shops in London, or the notorious intermediaries between landlord and tenants in Ireland ; rack-renting tenants, of which practice Ireland again can give a multitude of examples ; reductions of wages in some cases, in others fluctuations more disastrous perhaps than permanent low wages ; above all, neglect to secure that wages shall be well spent. And to this list of modes in which misery has been caused by the neglect or oppression of de-pendents, two more of great importance have yet to be added. One is the substitution of short for long periods of service, as of weeks, days, or even hours, instead of years and half-years ; as well as the reckless engagement and dismissal of workmen according to fluctuations in the market, instead of permanently employing the same number of men ; so that instead of being sure of a post for life if well-behaved, the mass of the workmen are without security for the future. The other is the agglomeration of workmen in great towns, and the consequent terrible condition of the dwellings of whole multitudes, for whom decent home-life is impossible.

Our limits only permit the barest outline of how this has come about, and how neglect and oppression in town and country have mutually fostered the evil. The rack-rented or evicted tenant, or the ill-paid agricultural labourer have been attracted by the higher wages in the towns, though often the apparent increase is delusive, through the higher prices and new and necessary sources of expense. The young especially have been attracted by the undue employment of youthful rather than of mature workmen, and by the allurements of the independence and pleasures of the town. And for the masses thus attracted and in such particular need of guidance and protection against the multiplied temptations, not only has protection been absent, but they have been driven headlong into vice by the neglect to provide even decent habitations. M. Le Play notices * the unparalleled state of things that arose in the great towns and manufacturing centres of Western

* "*Réforme Sociale*," ch. xlix. § 3.

Europe: "vast populations separated from their families, unknown to their new masters, without decent dwellings, without schools and churches, deprived, in a word, of the physical and moral conditions which till then had been judged indispensable to the existence of a civilized people." And if some of these evils have been remedied, the worst remains,—the utter want of decent dwellings for the great multitude. This want is both a cause and an expression of misery, and in no point is the inferiority of modern England and France to former times and (so-called) backward countries more plain than here. M. Le Play tells us that the tranquil life existing in the East of Europe, even in the poorest families, through the permanent possession of the domestic hearth, first opened his eyes to the untruth of certain Western doctrines on the organization of society.* And to those who, amid the vice and misery that surround us, console themselves with the thought that at any rate we have at last secured the equality of all citizens and the independence of the lower classes, we recommend the study of the 48th chapter of the same author's "*Réforme Sociale*," whence the remarks that follow are mainly drawn. Vain and disastrous are the efforts to replace the principle of brotherly love by that of equality. Mistaken is the notion that social forces tended formerly to inequality and now, in "advanced" countries, the other way. In reality the feudal distinctions of rank and class have been accompanied by institutions helping to secure equality among the masses of the population. This has been done most completely in the North and East of Europe by a triple precaution against individual weakness and folly: by the lord being obliged to aid from the feudal manor the families falling below a certain point of well-being; by the communistic periodical redistribution of land or restitution of what had been alienated; and by the patriarchal organization, whereby even the married sons remained at home working for the common profit, and subject to the head of the family. The trade guilds acted in a similar direction, averting the inequality which would have arisen, had individuals been able to turn to full account their individual advantages. "The more a man studies the ancient régime in the documents time has left us or in the institutions still flourishing, the more he will grow convinced that while it gave privileges to a few families, it tended above all to secure equality to the mass of the nation. Modern societies tend less to suppress privileged situations than to destroy the influences which formerly maintained among the people a sort of forced equality."† The

* "*L'Organisation du Travail*," § 24.

† "*Réforme Sociale*," ch. xlviii. § 2, 3.

barrier of community of property and of subjection to patriarchal, communal, or seigniorial authority being removed, the individual could fall or rise. In France since the Revolution custom sets a distinction between classes each day more conspicuous, and the nominal and boasted equality is especially burdensome to the lower classes, since those above, as their authority is unrecognized and their superiority envied and hated, trample on those below them instead of seeking to gain their affection and promote their success. So, for example, the former affectionate familiarity between the master and his domestic servants is seen no more. In another chapter of the same book * M. Le Play well marks the folly of making the workmen believe they can raise themselves (as a class, he means) without the help of the upper classes, and how misleading to make them stand to these as the French bourgeoisie stood to the noblesse before the Revolution—we may add perhaps also as the English middle class stood to the aristocracy before the first Reform bill, or the wealthy Roman plebeians to the patricians before the Licinio-Sextian Laws. For the bourgeoisie were excluded from honours and influence to which they were entitled by their wealth and talents, and these remained to be used in the service of their order. But the talented or wealthy workman can, and almost always does, quit his class and pass into the ranks of the bourgeoisie, leaving his former class with so much less capacity and means; nor, as a rule, is he a lover or protector of his former equals, but rather *eo immitior quia toleraverat*.

The length to which we have gone as to this fourteenth head must be justified by the common and extravagant delusions as to equality; as though without a return to the communistic organization of what are called early societies, you could level the greatest and most lasting and most galling of all inequalities, that of riches and poverty; as though, by refusing to recognize this inequality and the consequent mutual duties of rich and poor, you did not, like a sick man denying his sickness, make matters worse; and as though the rich could not and would not make the poor feel very plainly that the liberty and equality proffered to them were words, their subjection and inferiority a reality.†

The *fifteenth* head of misery is constituted by the improvidence, the *sixteenth* by the vices of the lower classes themselves; and these two are of all perhaps the most potent for

* "Réforme Sociale" ch. xlv. § 6.

† On the connection between wealth and nobility, see some suggestive remarks of Sir H. Maine in the fifth lecture of his "Early Institutions," especially pp. 133, 134.

the immediate and direct spread of misery. Many examples, we suppose, could be adduced of how high wages can exist together with wide-spread pauperism, and conversely, how in places where wages are low, the steadiness and frugality of the workmen can keep misery at bay. So we might compare the steady and low-paid workmen of Holland and the Hartz Mountains with the relatively highly-paid but vicious and improvident workmen too common in Paris or in the Black Country. In England, as is well known, intemperance is a fruitful cause of misery. Mr. Thomas Whittaker (in "Macmillan's Magazine," Dec., 1875) gives some startling figures and calculations. He tells us how £140,000,000 was uselessly spent on intoxicating drinks in 1873; how the poverty caused by drink costs £10,000,000 a year and the crime £9,000,000; how there is an increase of insanity, and a loss annually of 70,000 lives, and a waste of time during drinking, and serious injury to employers through interruption of their works; and he makes up the total wealth directly or indirectly wasted by the drinking system to some £270,000,000 yearly. Although this and kindred calculations must indeed be taken *cum grano salis*, still there is no doubt of the vast amount and terrible effects of drunkenness. But what we here wish to emphasize is the need not merely of giving the fact but also the *reason* for the fact that the people are drunken; and in general, the *reason* why in any given country the lower orders are vicious and improvident. And after what has been set forth at such length under the fourteenth head of the causes of misery, can we deny that in Western Europe the main reason has been the neglect or oppression of the lower classes by the upper? It follows that it is misleading to say the lower classes have the remedy for their misery in their own hands, and could soon be well off if they saved what they now spend in drink. In some cases of misery it is simply false; in others, though verbally true, it implies the falsehood that the upper classes are not to blame—are not the prime causes of the misery.*

* Mr. William Rathbone Greg seems to countenance the statement objected to in the text. We say "seems," for his remarks are somewhat obscure. We learn that the "great central truth" as to the sufferings of the proletariat is that these mischiefs "lie at their own door, and are remediable by and through themselves, and themselves alone" ("The Proletariat on a False Scent," reprinted in "Mistaken Aims of the Artisan Class," p. 258). But then he immediately adds, "not indeed without the co-operation of others"; and if this is so, then the said mischiefs are *not* remediable by themselves *alone*. On the next page he says: "How far their rulers and their betters are, even more than themselves—directly or indirectly, in the past or in the present—responsible for this ignorance, insobriety, improvidence, and unthrift, is a painful question which each man ought to ask him-

We have now completed our list of heads of causes of misery; and whoever looks them over will see that of the sixteen mentioned some are universal and permanent, some the peculiarity of certain times, places, and circumstances; so that in any given case of misery there must be a special examination to tell its causes. It is plain also that for the prevention or the remedy of misery, an accurate knowledge of the causes is most needful, and the assumption of a wrong cause capable of producing immense mischief. And this is the reason we have gone into this subject at such length.

From the list of causes of misery we can gather the possible field for charity. But the possible field may be much wider than the actual field. For many of the causes of misery, as a little consideration will show, can be averted or made less potent for evil by the three great social forces of association, of Christian patronage, and of Christian legislation. As to association, a good organization of the family is a great preventive of misery due to accidents affecting individuals, or to the improvidence or vice of the lower classes (3rd, 15th, and 16th heads); whether the organization be in the form of the patriarchal family such as exists, or till recently existed, in

self" (ib. p. 259). But then he quietly declines to discuss the answer, as not relevant to his immediate argument, which is confined to practical conclusions. The only meaning we can gather from this strange statement is, that the rich either never can or never will leave off demoralizing the poor; so that, for practical purposes, it is waste of time to discuss this process of demoralization. Later on, after making a calculation of what might be done by the working classes with the money they now spend in drink, he takes the occasion to asperse the moral character of socialist reformers, and triumphantly exclaims: "Were we not warranted in saying that the fate and future of the working classes, their salvation or their ruin, lie in their own hands—and in no others?" (ib. p. 271). But then, only four pages further on, we are told that "the condition of the agricultural labourer in many districts is an opprobrium and a calamity to the nation. He ought not to be suffered to remain in it; and he cannot (unassisted) raise himself out of it" (p. 275). We fully agree; but then, at least as to this great section of the working classes, their salvation or their ruin does *not* lie in their own hands. And as to drink itself, he says further on: "They [the best and most thoughtful of the artisan class] long to be protected against the temptations to drink which beset them on every side, and against which the weaker and perhaps more numerous brethren have not moral strength to protect themselves" (p. 294). Again he says: "The want of such [decent and healthy] dwellings lies at the root of much of their [the artisans'] wretchedness. The absence, or rather the unattainability, of them constitutes a most legitimate and crying grievance." And he notes the essential character of a home in which an existence not wholly unworthy shall be possible. "To the want of it . . . may be traced much of the vice and squalor and much of the destitution of our population—bad health, impure living, craving for drink, frequentation of public-houses and gin-shops," &c. (p. 296). Most excellent; but then it is as false of the urban as of the rural population to say that their sufferings lie at their own door, and are remediable by themselves alone.

Russia, or in the form which M. Le Play has well named the stem-family (*famille-souche*), such as was formerly common in Western Europe, and still prevails there in certain districts, and of which the leading feature is the permanence in time and fixity in place opposed to the shifting and dissolving families of England, France, and America. Other associations, such as the mediæval trade-guilds, the subsequent associations of journeymen, and the modern religious confraternities among the working classes act in the same way. The English trades unions have also been active in averting misery due to accidents affecting individuals, or to general or special crises, or to overwork and the employment of women and children (3rd, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th heads); and by teaching fellow-feeling, mutual help in a common cause, and individual sacrifice for the general weal, they have helped to stem vice and improvidence. But the much-boasted, much-patronized simple benefit societies and savings banks, based on a mere monetary calculation, though excellent means for the already prudent to secure themselves against disaster, create no link between man and man—are quite incapable of generating virtue or foresight, and are therefore of no avail to check the misery of the inferior types of the population.* As to Christian patronage, by which term is to be understood the care and protection of the lower classes by the upper, notably of workmen by their employers, and of peasant farmers by their landlords, its presence is the negation of the terrible fourteenth head of the causes of misery; it would be an effective bar to the clearing away of the peasantry, and to most cases of overwork, or undue employment of women and children (7th, 12th, 13th heads); it would greatly reduce the extent and intensity of vice and improvidence among the lower classes (15th and 16th heads); it would partially avert, partially mitigate, the misery due to general or special crises, to technical transformations, or to the accidents affecting individuals (9th, 10th, 11th, and 3rd heads). As to Christian legislation, it can act negatively and indirectly by removing the obstacles to a good organization of the family—importance here of good laws as to inheritance and the status of women, and also by removing the temptations to drunkenness, excess in the use of narcotics, and gambling. And it can directly act against injuries affecting

* This view, which we can now only thus cursorily state, and which to some may be displeasing, is based on the teaching of M. Périn and M. Le Play, both of such weight, and so distinct from each other, that their agreement on any important point of social science is no small presumption of its truth. See Périn, "*Richesses*," book vi. ch. viii.; Le Play, "*La Réforme Sociale*," ch. xlv. § vi.

individuals (4th head) by usury laws; against evictions of the peasantry (7th head) by laws on tenant right; against congestion of population (8th head) by facilitating emigration, as in Russia; against overwork, and the employment of women and children, and some of the extreme manifestations of neglect or oppression of dependents (12th, 13th, and 14th heads), by factory laws, regulation of mines, acts on artisans' dwellings, and the execution of strict measures of sanitary police.

In these ways the three great forces, association, patronage, and legislation, can check the causes of misery, and consequently limit the field for the action of charity. The term charity is here used in the narrow and strict sense. In the wide sense it would include all dealings with others based at all upon the principle of friendliness or benevolence, as opposed to the principle of indifference (upon which purely commercial dealings rest), and to the principle of hostility or malevolence; and in this wide sense would include family life, many forms of association, care of workpeople by the master, and gratuitous labour in the service of the State. But in the narrow sense, with which in this present discussion we are concerned, charity is the (total or partial) surrender of our person, or goods, or both, to the service of the poor, especially those in misery. Now for charity, even in this narrow sense, there is a permanent field; for with external nature and man's internal condition as they are, we must admit as permanent sources of misery the accidents and injuries affecting masses (1st and 2nd heads), to a certain extent even those only affecting individuals (3rd and 4th heads), and the improvidence and vice of the lower classes. *Semper pauperes habetis vobiscum.* And in any given case, as modern England, there may be bad laws and absence of patronage, and insufficiency or abuse of association, opening a boundless field for the spread of misery and the action of charity.

And now, before considering the conditions for charity to be efficacious, we must say a word on the grave obligation imposed on Christians of giving relief to the destitute. It is not necessary here to enter into the details of moral theology, such as the different degrees of necessity and of goods, or the order in which persons have a claim on our charitable aid, or the proportion of our revenue to be given up. It is enough to say that even moral theologians treating not of Christian perfection, but of the very minimum which is absolutely required from all, have to admit a tremendous obligation. And the fathers of the Church, mingling precept and counsel, have set forth the duties of the rich in such forcible terms as to give plausibility to the calumny that they attacked the

rights of ownership.* Above all in the Gospels, not merely is the duty of almsgiving repeatedly enjoined, but the awful results of neglecting it are set forth in two passages, which may well fill the rich with terror: the history, namely, of Dives and Lazarus in the 16th chapter of S. Luke; and, above all, the description of the last judgment in the 25th chapter of S. Matthew, where the fulfilment or neglect of the corporal works of mercy is made the distinguishing mark between the elect and the reprobate.† Let this be enough on the teachings of Christianity, which, indeed, are quite unmistakable, and have been cast in its teeth by the enemies of God's Church and God's poor.

It is, however, not sufficient to know the duty, but also the fit method of giving, lest by giving wrongly we injure rather than help. This knowledge we can gain from Christian principles and practice, and guided by these, we will now set forth the conditions for the efficacy of charity, the violation of which, as injuring the receiver or others, must be condemned by the very principle of fraternal charity on which almsgiving itself rests. And as with the causes of misery, so here, we will make heads for convenience of reference, rather than a formal and logical classification, not seeking greater precision than the nature of the subject permits. And here also, with certain deviations, we follow M. Périn, who has treated the subject in the 2nd and 5th chapters of the 7th book of his "*Richesses*."

The *first* condition to be observed in the exercise of charity is, that whenever there is wanting anything as to faith and morals, or as to common knowledge and common sense, the help given must aim at remedying the vice, the folly, or the ignorance—must aim at the moral and intellectual reform of the poor. The material gift is only a part of charity,—often the least; and if without moral action, often more injurious than useful. "What constitutes charity," says M. Périn, "is the gift of the man himself, with all his superiorities, moral and intellectual." These superiorities are to be put at the service of the poor; and part of the importance of the material gift is to be a means of winning influence to be used for the purposes of moral guidance. "The gift of oneself, the word of consolation or encouragement, a glance of compassion, a tear

* See Périn, "*Richesse*," vol. ii. pp. 361—363; Champagny, "*La Charité Chrétienne dans les Premiers Siècles de l'Eglise*," pp. 36—44, 291, 292.

† The significance of these two passages is noted by Mgr. Dupanloup, "*Charité Chrétienne*," p. 103.

in the eye, are more to the poor than the material help."* As S. Chrysostom well says, the word is more powerful than the gift.† So, then, it should be laid down as a leading principle, that there should be no relief given to the corporal wants of the poor without relief also to their spiritual wants.‡ And when we remember the inseparable connection of religion and morality, we come to the further conclusion that all relief should be of a religious character, and given in the name of God.

The *second* condition is, that the relief be looked on neither by giver or receiver as any disgrace to the poor; and this implies that poverty itself be not considered as a disgrace, and that relief be so given as not to dishonour or humiliate. In striking contrast to the views of paganism, the Christian doctrine exalts the poor and poverty, and tells us how God Himself came on earth as a poor man; how gifts to the poor are gifts to our Lord; how the poor are higher in the spiritual order than the rich, and have a quicker and clearer insight into the truths of religion; how they hold the first place in the Church, and the rich are admitted in order to serve them; how poverty in spirit is needful for all; and how voluntary poverty is a counsel of perfection. Such doctrines teach the rich man to reverence the poor, to be eager for their prayers, to be glad of their presence, knowing that by serving them he becomes rather their debtor than their creditor; and they look on him as the minister of the bounty of God, in whose name the alms are given; they see in him one whom they are bound to love and to follow with gratitude, and whom they can requite with their prayers. And thus there is mutual benefit and mutual gratitude, according to the providential harmony of riches and poverty: Dives et pauper obviaverunt sibi; utriusque operator est Deus.

The *third* condition, following as a natural consequence of the two first, is that those who personally relieve the poor must be lovers of the poor, and lovers not merely of such as are attractive, but of those physically and morally repulsive, the filthy, drunken, complaining, ungrateful poor. For to effect the moral reform there must arise true intimacy based on love, persistent untiring love, that will at last inspire confidence and touch the heart of the poor. How the fulfilment of this third condition is helped forward by the Christian view of almsgiving and poverty is evident. Not merely is even

* Ratzinger, "Geschichte der kirchlichen Armenpflege," p. 116.

† Κρείττον γὰρ λόγος ἢ δόσις. Apud Ratzinger, l. c.

‡ This may be taken as a translation of Ratzinger's principle: "Keine Armenpflege ohne Seelsorge," l. c. p. 414.

the most degraded and repulsive of the poor our brother, and one for whom Christ has died, but he represents our Lord in a special way, which is not done by the rich and cultivated. And this truth has been beautifully illustrated by many recorded apparitions of our Lord and his Blessed Mother disguised in rags and poverty as some unhappy mendicant. The view of the service of the poor being a benefit to the giver, is another great means of instilling love. This has been so well put by a great friend of the poor, Frederic Ozanam, that we give a rough translation of his words: "Think not, besides, that to look on charity as a means of preserving the faith, is to lower the idea of this lofty virtue, but rather to raise it and to teach us that in visiting the poor we gain more than they. For by witnessing their sufferings we become better ourselves, and in our heart arises such a sense of thankfulness towards these poor sufferers that we come to feel we indeed love them. Oh, how often have I myself, cast down by some internal trouble, and sometimes by anxiety as to my uncertain health, entered in sorrow the house of the poor family entrusted to my care; and there, seeing how many there were more unfortunate than myself, I have grown ashamed of my own depression, and have felt fresh strength to bear up; and thus I have had to thank those unfortunate poor for having helped me to bear my sufferings by the sight of theirs; and how then could I help loving them the more?"* And to show the intimate connection of this third condition with the spirit of Christian self-sacrifice, we must be allowed to give another citation, this time from M. Périn: "It is again the respect for and love of the poor, which have created such diversified orders for the alleviation of all kinds of misery. All classes of self-sacrifice are linked together. Those who consecrate their life to God by a vow of virginity consecrate it by the same act to their brethren, and become the most active ministers of charity. By the celibacy of the clergy and of the religious orders, the Church has created servants of the poor, such as societies, for whom this sacrifice has been too much, have never been able to obtain. It is a constant experience, that in order to love and serve the poor, it is necessary to be poor, if not in reality, at least in heart. It is the poor who give to the poor. Those priests and religious who make themselves poor for the love of Christ, love the poor and are loved by them, understand the poor and are understood by them, as men living in the world never can be, howsoever detached in

* Ozanam, "Parole alla Conferenza fiorentina."—*Œuvres*, vol. viii. pp 46-48.

spirit they be from temporal goods. Those know how to draw from their poverty inexhaustible treasures of almsgiving. They have often been denounced as idlers by economic materialism; yet they accomplish in society, by the works of charity, the most toilsome of labours, while of all labourers they are the least rewarded. They place at the disposal of the poor a life free from all the cares of family and all the anxieties of wealth. Recruited from both the higher and lower ranks of society, equally honoured by all on account of their character, they are the natural intermediaries between the rich and the poor.* In conclusion we may notice how this third condition for the efficacy of charity is plainly violated by the employment of hired agents to seek out, examine, and relieve the poor.

The *fourth* condition is the exercise of circumspect generosity. If the duty of almsgiving is inculcated by the Church, so also is the duty of labour. And she gives a rational ground for her teaching and rational inducements for its observance, unlike those economists who denounce the idleness of the poor without giving them any convincing reason why they should not rather enjoy themselves than work. The principle of Christian poor-relief is not to give to the false poor the substance of Christ, which belongs to the true poor (S. Jerome),† not to help idle vagabonds, since "if any one will not work, let him not eat" (2 Thess. iii. 10). The modest poor rather than the importunate are to be helped; and when other means fail to bring about a moral reform, recourse may be had to severity, and material help be refused. Yet we must remember, as to the application of this severity, that its object is not to inflict punishment, but to cause amendment. Therefore, in first giving help, we should avoid laying too much stress upon the former life of the sufferer, nor should we expose him to an insulting and indelicate inquisition. "Charity," says S. Ambrose, weighs not merit so severely, but rather, above all, comes to the help of distress. "Let a poor man," says S. John Chrysostom, "come to your door in want of bread, and you reproach him with his idleness, without thinking that you also are idle, and yet God gives you abundance of wealth. . . . If we scrutinize so inquisitively the claims of our fellow-servants, God will do the same with us, as He will judge us according as we have judged."‡ Only where the recipient makes himself subsequently unworthy, and the efforts to reform

* Périn, "De la Richesse," vol. ii. p. 436.

† Apud Périn, l. c. p. 429.

‡ See the two citations, Périn, "Richesse," ii. pp. 429, 430.

him are fruitless, should relief be withdrawn; and even then the door should be left open to amendment, and mercy should ever sit waiting to receive back and welcome any who seriously try to live in soberness and industry. And under the term generosity should, we think, be included that magnificence which S. Thomas reckons among the virtues, that lavish expenditure which corresponds to the nobleness and dignity of the work. Better indeed is a church or a hospital with mud walls and straw roof than no church or hospital at all. But where possible, there it is well that, just as the service of God should be conducted with external splendour, so too in fit proportion the service of the poor. Thus where means are available, it seems well that charitable buildings should be beautiful and richly adorned; and, if on occasions of public or private rejoicing, as a wedding or the anniversary of some national deliverance, a grand banquet is considered a right use of wealth, it seems fit that from time to time in the very food and drink of the lowest poor, some splendour should be shown. Thus we should approve the grand distribution on one day to a multitude of poor described by Montalembert, in his *Life of S. Elizabeth*, while for the impotent, who remained behind for the night, fires were kindled, fresh distributions made, and their feet washed and perfumed, so that they began to sing for joy.* And let us be glad that in our own country, where the true principles of charity have been for long more set at naught than, perhaps, anywhere else, at least there is a touching effort made, that on the day when God was born in extreme poverty, no poor family should be in want of a good meal.†

* "Vie de Ste. Elizabeth," ii. pp. 131-135, 12^e éd.

† The following passage from Mgr. Dupanloup's "*Charité Chrétienne*," p. 134, illustrates what we have called circumspect generosity: "La charité qui aime à voir les pauvres de près, et à entrer dans le secret et dans le détail de leurs misères, et qui ne leur jette pas administrativement ses profusions, de loin, avec dédain et sans choix; la charité qui est délicate, qui est ingénieuse, qui est confiante, qui ne s'épuise pas en chiffres et ne répand pas son zèle en calculs et en statistiques, mais qui prodigue ses bienfaits sans mesure et se prodigue elle-même après avoir tout donné." And to those who think mediæval theologians were lost in abstractions and unfit for practical questions, we commend the following passage from S. Thomas. He has to meet the objection against abundant almsgiving drawn from 2 Cor. iii. 13: "Non ut aliis sit remissio," id est ut alii de vestris otiose vivant, "vobis autem sit tribulatio," id est paupertas." He answers with simplicity and precision: "Loquitur de abundantia eleemosynæ, quæ superexcedit necessitatem recipientis; cui non est danda eleemosyna, ut inde luxurietur, sed ut inde sustentetur. Circa quod tamen est discretio adhibenda, propter diversas conditiones hominum, quorum quidam delicatius nutriti indigent magis delicatis cibis aut vestibus. Unde Ambrosius dicit ("De Offic.," lib. i.

The *fifth* condition for charity to do its work is that it have a wide and lasting organization. There is need of association, so that by mutual concert the distribution of alms be regular, the unreflecting preferences and unavoidable mistakes of individuals be rectified by mutual control, and charity reach the maximum of usefulness through mutual counsel and experience. We have seen how there is need of special qualities in one who would act as the distributor of alms to the poor; and in many states of society a man of the world, unacquainted with the life of the poor, if he took upon himself personally to distribute, would give rather to the most importunate than the most needy, and perhaps to imposters in no need at all. Not as though there was no permanent and universal field for individual or isolated as opposed to collective charity. There is such a field, for example, in cases where friends or personal acquaintances are in danger of falling from a higher rank into poverty, or in the touching cases where the poor themselves are the givers of relief to those in still greater poverty. But as regards the charitable relief of the poor by the rich, it can be laid down, we think, as the general rule, that such relief should be collective not isolated, and that the charitable bodies should be in connection with each other. How the unrivalled organization of the Catholic Church and the unity of her teaching and practice, give great facilities for the organization of charity, is too plain to need illustration.* It is also easy to see how the difficulties of good organization are incalculably increased by the presence of many religions mixed up together. We may notice two special dangers that ensue. First, relief may be used as a bribe to the poor to pass from one religion to another; secondly, by want of communication and concert between the charitable workers of different religions, the attempt at the moral reform of the degraded poor may in a

cap. xxx. ad fin.): 'Consideranda est in largiendo ætas atque debilitas; nonnunquam etiam verecundia, quæ ingenuos prodit natales; aut si quis ex divitiis in egestatem accidit sine vitio suo'" (2a 2æ qu. 33, a. 10).

* But we do not see that this justifies the very strong statement of M. Périn ("Richesse," ii. p. 437): "The Church alone can organize charity without enslaving it (sans l'asservir)." What is the use of saying this, though it be true, if its truth cannot be *proved*? The ground of the statement seems to be that the State cannot organize charity without enslaving it. This can indeed be shown to be the case; but then this is no *proof* that religious bodies other than the Church, or even private lay associations, share the incapacity of the State. We quite recognize that (as M. Périn notices, ib. 439) the Church is unrivalled for works of charity, and, what is here to the point, can be *shown* to be such; and that a very convincing argument in favour of her divine mission can be drawn from the history of her charity. But this is all the more reason for not giving our enemies the appearance of a victory, by making statements which we may have to modify or withdraw.

great measure be frustrated. For the idle and profligate, when relief is withdrawn from them by those of their own religion, or accompanied with advice and rebuke that are unwelcome, may be able to set this salutary discipline at naught by obtaining relief from other sources. We may add that a fresh and vast increase is made in the difficulty of organization when the Government joins in the office of giving relief. In London the disorganization has (or till recently had) perhaps reached the furthest point possible, and has been one among several other causes for the growth of that detestable race of charity-hunters and thief-beggars so graphically described by observers like Mr. Thomas Wright and Mr. Greenwood.*

In a paper like the present on general principles, it would be out of place to discuss the practical remedies for such evils, in other words, the concrete application of the general principles for the efficacy of charity. We will only make three observations; one, that as regards such applications we think little can be laid down in general, but the local circumstances, not so much of each country as of each district, village, town, or even quarter of a large town, must be separately considered. So, for example, the conduct of the guardians in two English Poor Law Unions may so differ as to cause a different action of private charity to be fitting in the two cases. Our second observation is, that for those to whom we are primarily addressing ourselves, namely, the Catholics of England, the question is of less practical importance; and none of them need be in any difficulty as to the concrete way in which they can fulfil the precept of charity. If, as is to be wished, they can give personal service, there are open to them Catholic associations (such as the Society of S. Vincent of Paul) in which this service may be easily and fruitfully performed. If they can only give alms, there are abundant Catholic good works and institutions which these alms can forward; and there is one simple rule to be observed, which is, never to give to beggars in the street (still less at the church-doors)† nor to any applicants who are not personally and thoroughly known to them. And if they would rationally imitate those examples so beautiful and so fit in other times and places, of saintly benefactors of the poor from whom no one ever asked an alms in vain, let them, as we have heard suggested, open as it were a current account with the poor, and whenever asked for an

* Thomas Wright, "Our New Masters," last chapter. Greenwood, "Seven Curses of London," ch. xiii. to xv.

† Let it be well remembered that we are speaking of *modern England*, and are saying nothing against giving alms at the church-doors in *other countries or in other times*.

alms, refuse indeed the beggar, but place to the credit of their charitable fund a corresponding amount, which otherwise they would have given perhaps to a drunkard or a thief.* Our third and last observation is addressed to our Protestant countrymen, who indeed are concerned to reform the fearful abuse, both by the paid officials and by the depraved poor, of the vast sums spent in charity. And we say plainly that to us there seems little hope of their success, unless, indeed, they change very much their views and methods of action. As long as relief is given without being accompanied by an attempt at the moral reform of the poor; as long as it is given by hired agents instead of by the loving hands of a voluntary servant of the poor; as long as poverty is not exalted as a higher state, and the giver does not recognize that he is rather indebted to the poor than they to him; as long as the workhouse remains as a last resource, whose terrors are precisely least for those, namely the lowest strata of the population, whom it is most needful to terrify, we question whether any serious reform is possible, and whether the co-operation between the different charities, and between these and the Poor Law, and elaborate investigation of claims for help, and repression of mendicity (points aimed at in particular by the London Charity Organization Society), can do more than check a few of the most flagrant cases of imposture: a work that might better, perhaps, be undertaken by the police, and helped on by making the punishment for receiving money under false pretences more rigorous or more rigorously enforced.†

* We may refer to some practical remarks for English Catholics in our number for July, 1874, pp. 48-53, where there is a similar caution against London beggars. We are glad to say that a very important work there urged, namely, some organization for "the apprenticeship, protection, and safe emigration" of children coming out of our orphanages and industrial schools, has been begun by the Patronage Committee of the Society of S. Vincent of Paul, with which all Catholic employers should be in communication. We may notice as another practical point, that in those Unions where the guardians do not send the Catholic children to Catholic schools, that is, where entering the workhouse means the forced apostasy of the unhappy children, almost all other works of mercy should give precedence to that of rescuing these victims from this cruel persecution.

† Lest we be misunderstood, we wish here at once to express our warmest admiration for the zeal and self-sacrifice shown by many members of the Charity Organization Society, and only wish that such examples would stir up many Catholics to give not merely alms, but personal service, to the poor in Catholic confraternities and associations. Still, we think it may be questioned whether as a body the Charity Organization Society, by the employment of hired agents and by the wounds which its rigorous inquisitions inflict upon the feelings of honour of the lower classes, does not neutralize the gain arising from its exposure of impostures, and from the frequent material help which it gives to cases of distress.

The *sixth* and last condition for the efficacy of charity is, that it be free; that no one be compelled to give, and no one hindered from giving; and only a few natural and simple restrictions be put upon the manner of giving. We hope in a subsequent article to express our full meaning on this head, and give reasons for our opinion. At present we prefer to say nothing further, rather than expose ourselves to possible misinterpretation by a discussion which would have to be hurried and imperfect.

We have now completed our account of the six principles of poor relief, or conditions for the efficacy of charity. They may, perhaps, be illustrated by recording one notable case of their non-observance. If we rightly remember the time and the place, in Lewisham, early in this year 1877, was posted up publicly, in two places at least, a list of paupers receiving outdoor relief; and this was done with the intention of reducing their number by the disgrace of publication. This incident reveals a violation of five out of the six afore-given conditions. No moral reform could be attempted within or without the workhouse by the poor-law officers; the gift was made a disgrace; the poor-law officers were certainly not lovers of the poor in the sense we have explained above; there was neither circumspection nor generosity; and lastly, the rate-payers were forced to give to the support of the poor under circumstances which by no means justified such compulsion.

Let us add one final remark upon the principles of charity. It is that, although these principles are always the same, the application of them may be, as we have already noticed, very different, according to times and circumstances. Consequently we are likely to fall into error if we raise up some particular application into a general principle. Thus the rule of giving no alms to any beggar in the street, though, as we have urged, it may be excellent for modern London, would have been a very bad rule in Rome in the last century, where there existed an organized confraternity of beggars whose excellence and beauty, especially in the features of mutual charity among the beggars, and union in religious exercises, can be seen even through the unfavourable medium of Sir A. Paget's report,* from which we give the following account:—

During the greater part of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there existed a regularly authorized beggars' society, designated by the name of the Company of S. Elizabeth. It had between 400 and 500 members, each of whom contributed two *bajocchi* and a half (about 2½d.) a month towards

* "Report on Poor-laws in Foreign Countries. Accounts and Papers," 1875, vol. lxx.

the expenses of religious ceremonies, of which there were many. Once a year the blind, led by the lame, went in penitential procession with a military escort to visit four churches. Penalties were inflicted on members of the company who failed to pay their subscriptions, or were wanting in due respect to their superior officers. No one was allowed to beg in the streets who was not a member. Children, able-bodied men and women, and foreigners, were excluded. Strangers, however, were sometimes allowed to beg in the winter on payment of the ordinary subscription. All the members of the company were furnished with licences. They practised begging among themselves, certain of the brethren being charged with the duty of soliciting alms from the rest for those who were ill. On Sundays one of the officers of the company, called *Camerlengo*, who was lame, accompanied by two who were blind, called the *Signore* and the *Guardiano*, went about the town with fiddles and a *poet* to collect offerings for the feast of the patroness of the society, S. Elizabeth. The custom was to carry a silver basin for contributions, with ten crowns and a silver snuff-box in it; and every one who put money into the former was asked to take a pinch of snuff from the latter. This grotesque trade union, which was founded in 1613, and lasted until the Revolution at the end of the eighteenth century, was placed under the protection of a cardinal. Its last protector was Cardinal York (pp. 456, 457).

Let this example suffice against rash generalizations and unhistorical narrowmindedness. And now, having completed the first part of our subject, and set forth what seems to us the truth as to almsgiving, there remains the second task of criticising views on almsgiving that differ from our own. But this we must reserve for a subsequent article.

ART. V.—TURKEY AND RUSSIA.

The East and the West: our Dealings with our Neighbours. Essays by different hands. Edited by the Hon. HENRY STANLEY. London: Hatchard & Co. 1865.

Le Patriarche Hassoun. Le Schisme Arménien dans ses Rapports avec le Concile Œcuménique. Londres et Genève. 1872.

Foreign Policy: England and the Eastern Question. By the Right Hon. Lord MONTAGU, M.P. Second Edition. London: Chapman & Hall. 1877.

Turkey, Nos. 25 and 26, 1877. Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Turkey, presented to both Houses of Parliament.

EARLY in the present year, Captain Burnaby, who was then amongst the Turks on the Armenian frontier, wrote home to a friend that, so far as he could judge, they were full of fight and eager for the coming struggle with the Russians, notwithstanding that the army assembling in Armenia was a small one. "Poor fellows!" he added, "they do not know that the God of Battles is the God of big battalions." The struggle has come, we are now in the sixth month of the war, and it can hardly be said that hitherto the God of Battles has been on the side of the big battalions.

At noon on April 24, after having been reviewed by the Czar in person, three strong Russian columns crossed the European frontier of the Ottoman empire in the midst of a storm of driving rain, which so swelled the rivers that the passage of the Pruth was a slow, tedious operation. At early dawn upon the same day, *six hours before the declaration of war*,* between 10,000 and 15,000 Russians had entered Armenia between Alexandropol and Batoum, and disarmed the Turkish posts on the frontier. Later in the day three more columns invaded Armenia. On the Asiatic frontier the Grand Duke Michael and General Melikoff put in motion on that April morning no less than 110,000 men, the "army of the Caucasus," after the Imperial Guard, the best troops of the Russian empire. The most northern column of the four marched by the sea-coast against Batoum, a fortified port, the possession of which has long been coveted by Russia. The next column was destined for the capture of Ardahan, a town with ruined walls, which had never been repaired since they were breached by the Russian

* Blue Book on Turkey, XXV. of 1877, p. 86.

artillery in 1828. The third column, under the command of Melikoff, was to march direct upon Kars; the fourth, which marched from Erivan, was to occupy Bayazid, a town with a strong castle, almost at the foot of Mount Ararat. The four columns were to unite to the westward of Kars, after that great fortress had been invested by portions of the two central columns. The united army was then to occupy Erzeroum and Trebizond. To oppose the forces set in motion against him, Ahmed Mouktar Pasha, the Turkish commander in Asia, had about 30,000 men a few miles to the west of Kars. There were less than 10,000 men in Batoum; about 20,000 garrisoned Kars; and there were weak columns of Turkish troops at Ardahan and Bayazid. At Bagdad there were fully 35,000 men, who were destined not to fire a shot in the first campaign. They had been assembled in the Euphrates valley to watch the action of Persia, whom rumour already spoke of as the ally of Russia. No sooner had war been declared than Persia gave proof that she was still unenslaved to the Russian cause, by breaking up her camps on the Turkish frontier and withdrawing the troops into the interior. But the army of Bagdad was too far removed from the field of active operations to take any part in the war this year. So long as the event of the conflict in Armenia was doubtful, it remained in the Euphrates valley. It was not until September that it received orders to descend the great river into the Persian Gulf and proceed by sea to Europe.

Sixty thousand Russians had entered Roumania on the first day of the war, 15,000 crossing the frontier at Unghemi, 10,000 at Leova, and 35,000 at Bolgrad. From Unghemi a railway line runs to Jassy, and thence down the valley of the Sereth. It crosses that river a few miles above its confluence with the Danube by the important railway bridge of Barboschi; thence it runs on to Bucharest and Giurgevo (opposite Rustchuk). On the 25th a Russian division occupied Galatz and secured the Barboschi bridge. On the same day the ministers of Prince Charles of Roumania issued a proclamation which we must here denounce as an act of lying hypocrisy. This proclamation* informed the Roumanian people that on the 23rd (11th O.S.) the Grand Vizier had requested the ministry at Bucharest to confer with Abdul Kerim in order to concert measures for resisting a Russian invasion of the Ottoman empire which appeared to be imminent; that next day came news that the Russians had crossed the Pruth; that in view of these two events Roumania would remain neutral

* Turkey, XXV. of 1877, pp. 167, 168.

until the Chambers had decided what should be its policy; and that the Roumanian army was therefore ordered to retire from the frontier in order to avoid all conflict with the invaders. A week before, the Russian representative at Bucharest had signed a convention with Roumania which placed the roads, railways, and resources of the country at the disposal of the Russian Government.* The proclamation issued by M. Bratiano and his colleagues on the 25th was a public lie. Had the ministry performed their duties as the Government of a feudatory of the Turkish empire,—at least, if they could not resist the crossing of the Pruth, they would have done nothing to facilitate it. But they openly violated the law, which, to their honour be it said, the Turks studiously observed. It was not until May 3rd that, the Roumanian Government having published its convention with Russia, the Turkish Government broke off relations with Roumania, and bombarded Kalafat, Giurgevo, and Ibrail. The Turks indeed carried forbearance too far; they might easily have destroyed the Barboschi bridge on the 24th, and on the next day, when the Roumanians in a kind of panic evacuated Kalafat, Osman Pasha might have crossed from Widin and occupied the place without firing a shot. But the Turks kept to their own bank of the Danube; for a few days at least the fiction that Roumania was neutral was observed; meanwhile the Russians crossed the Sereth and began to occupy Moldavia, advancing chiefly by the roads, the railway being used for the most part for the transport of stores and matériel. The advance of the army was slow, for during the first weeks of the war continual rain made the roads deep and heavy, swelled the rivers, and in some places destroyed the railway line and the bridges by floods. However, by the 24th of May it seems that the Russians had upwards of 200,000 men in Roumania. They occupied the line of the Danube from the Aluta to Galatz, the headquarters were at Ploesti, to the north of Bucharest, and the Roumanian army held Kalafat and the adjoining district. Several attempts had been made to cross the Danube, but none of them were serious, and probably their real object was to ascertain something of the position and force of the Turkish corps of observation on the opposite bank.

If the Turks did nothing else during the first weeks of the war in Europe they most effectually concealed both their numbers and their position. All we know is that the grand total of the Turkish forces in Bulgaria was under 200,000 men. Osman Pasha had about 40,000 at Widin, Abdul Kerim was

* Turkey, XXVI. of 1877, pp. 181, &c.

with the main body in the great intrenched camp of Shumla, perhaps the strongest fortress in the world. There were garrisons in the Danube fortresses and at Varna, and small detached corps in the Balkan passes. At Nish 10,000 or 15,000 men observed the Servian camp of Alexinatz. Those of course could take no part in the Danube campaign. Further west 50,000 splendid troops, under the command of Ali Saib, Mehemet Ali, and Suleiman Pashas were engaged in a useless warfare with the Montenegrins. They stormed the Duga Pass; they revictualled for the twentieth time the wretched hill fort of Nicksics, which should have been abandoned and blown up months before by the Turks; they penetrated into the heart of Montenegro, and proved (as Omar Pasha had proved in 1862) that, *pace* the Laureate and Mr. Gladstone, "unconquered Tsernagora" is not invincible. But all this was a barren result to buy with the lives of 10,000 men.

Until the middle of June the Russians were concentrating in Roumania; the batteries of Widin and Kalafat, Nikopol and Turnu, Rustchuk and Giurgevo, Turtukai and Oltenitza, were exchanging fire across the broad stream; there were reports of attempts to cross, but none of them succeeded, and it seemed doubtful if the operation would be successfully accomplished at all, so that at times there were rumours of a coming attempt to turn the formidable line of the Danube, by a march through Servia. Meanwhile events of the greatest importance had occurred in Asia. Of the four columns that had invaded Armenia, the first was stopped by the resistance of Batoum, suffering on the second day of the war a disastrous defeat among the hills to the east of the town. The second occupied Ardahan after a brief struggle, which was brought to a close by the cowardice, or, what is more probable, the treachery, of the Pasha in command, who suddenly abandoned the town after repelling two assaults. Leaving a garrison there, the main body continued its advance. Melikoff's column, the third and strongest of the four, drove in the various detachments between Kars and the Russian frontier, and invested the great fortress. The fourth column occupied Bayazid without any resistance, and then, turning to the north-westward, sought to communicate with the central column of Melikoff. Kars being invested, Melikoff began his advance towards Erzeroum. Ahmed Mouktar Pasha steadily retired before him, and on June 7th the Russian advanced guard was at Olti, almost in sight of Erzeroum. The correspondents of the English press were unanimous in predicting

a Russian victory, and denouncing the incapacity of Mouktar.* In Erzeroum itself the agents of Russia were openly planning a capitulation; the wretched administration of the War Office, then in the hands of Redif Pasha, gave Mouktar the most insufficient means of action; yet, in the face of all this, this brave man fell back upon Erzeroum, and bided his time. If no one else trusted him, he could depend upon the 30,000 men who formed his little army, and the time for action soon came.

The base of the Russian army of Armenia was Georgia or Transcaucasia, and all supplies, in order to reach Georgia, have to come through the Caucasus. This mountain chain extends from the Sea of Azov and the Black Sea to the shores of the Caspian, a great rampart, the summits of which rise above the snow-line, and which is pierced by only two gateways, one a pass of little importance, the other the great pass of the Vladikaukas, a defile traversed by a good military road, which formed the line by which the army of Melikoff drew its supplies and its reinforcements from Russia. Till within the last fifteen years, the valleys and the lofty plateaux of the Caucasus were the home of what we in Europe call the Circassian tribes,—men who for eighty years had successfully resisted the arms and the intrigues of Russia. It was only by a cruel war of extermination that Russia completed, in 1864, the conquest of the Caucasus, the greater portion of the Circassian tribes being either foully massacred or driven into exile. If some of the Circassians have done deeds of blood in Turkey, they have only “bettered the instruction” which Russia gave them, and revenged upon the allies of Russia the terrible wrongs they suffered at her hands.† When the war began, the Russians had no fear of a Circassian rising; the Caucasus was disarmed and all but depopulated, for the best of the men had gone into exile in 1864. On May 14th a

* During the Servian war Mouktar had the misfortune to be left in command of a corps of 5,000 very poor troops in the Herzegovina, and was defeated by the Montenegrins. If he had been anything else but a good general, his little force would have been annihilated. *Messieurs les stratèges* of the press, having heard of this defeat, denounced Mouktar until he had freed Armenia, and practically proved that they were mistaken.

† The Circassian chiefs, in their petition to the Queen of England, presented through the English ambassador at Constantinople in April, 1864, declared that “the Russian army slaughters like sheep the children, helpless women, and old men that fall into its hands. It rolls about their heads with the bayonet like melons, and there is no act of oppression and cruelty which is beyond the pale of civilization and humanity, and which defies description, which it has not committed” (Blue Book on Circassia, 1864, p. 2). On March 17th, 1864, Consul Dickson reported from Soukhoun

Turkish squadron bombarded and captured the port of Soukhoum Kaleh, which is situated on the eastern shore of the Black Sea, at the point where the Caucasian chain begins to recede from the sea and trend to the eastward. Here several thousand Turkish and Circassian regulars were landed, as well as a supply of arms for the insurgent bands that had already appeared in the coast districts. From Soukhoum the insurrection spread rapidly into the interior. A Russian corps had to be withdrawn from the field army, in order to cover Tiflis and act against the insurgents. The Vladikaukas was seized, and the mountain road destroyed. The only means left for supplying the Russian army in Asia was by the Caspian Sea, stores being embarked at Astrakhan, landed at Baku, and carried over the hills to Tiflis and Erivan. But this line of communication was almost a useless one. In the upper part of the Caspian the navigation is difficult; ships go aground out of sight of land; the whole northern part of the great lake is little better than shoal water; goods have to be embarked at Astrakhan in lighters and towed out to sea some miles before they are shipped. When they are landed at Baku, the transport by the hill-roads is very slow and difficult, for the roads are very bad, and even a little rain makes them impassable. When, therefore, the Circassian insurgents seized the Vladikaukas, the Russians in Asia found themselves cut off from their only *good* line of communication, and to the end of the campaign they had to suffer from shortness of supplies,* and while they could expect few reinforcements, they had to divert some of their best troops from Armenia to the Caucasus. The advance upon Erzeroum suddenly came to a stop. On June 8th the Russian advanced guard evacuated Olti, which Mouktar occupied, after a sharp skirmish with the retiring troops. For a week the two armies faced each other, the Turkish left being at Olti, the right at the pass of Delibaba, with a division, commanded by Mehemet Pasha, thrown forward into the plain of Zeidikhan. On the 17th the Rus-

Kaleh :—"A Russian detachment, having captured the village of Toobeh, inhabited by about 100 Abadzekh, after they had surrendered themselves prisoners, they were all massacred by the Russian troops. Amongst the victims were two women in an advanced state of pregnancy, and five children" (Blue Book, 1864, p. 3).

* A Tiflis correspondent of the *Golos*, writing early in September, says that up to that time Melikoff had been reinforced with only one of the three divisions promised to him; but he added that, on the whole, it was better the two other divisions had not come, for they would have probably been starved, as the roads of the Caucasus were impracticable, and the transport from Baku most difficult, and provisions of all kinds were therefore scarce in the Russian camps.

sians in great force attacked Zeidikhan, Mehemet was killed by a bursting shell, and his army, in utter confusion, fell back upon the pass. The Russophile press announced that the whole Turkish army of Asia was compromised, and on the verge of destruction. But the success of the Russians was purely a local one. They did not venture to attack Delibaba. Under the pressure of the rising in the Caucasus, their Armenian campaign had broken down, and, despite their superior numbers, they no longer acted on the offensive. Now came the time for the Turks to strike. The Russians, repulsed in another attack upon Batoum, were in their turn assailed by the garrison, and driven from their positions on the banks of the Tchuruk Sou. Ismail Pasha, with a few Turkish battalions, and clouds of Kurdish horsemen, fell upon Bayazid, retook the town, and shut up the Russian garrison in the old citadel. Ahmed Mouktar Pasha, rapidly concentrating to his right, advanced from Delibaba into the plain of Zeidikhan, and drove back the Russian left, and then, in a series of battles which followed this first success, he forced Melikoff back upon Kars. On July 2nd the defeated Russian army passed to the eastward of the fortress, abandoning the trenches, and withdrawing the siege guns on the western side. Next day Ahmed Mouktar entered the city in triumph. The siege was over. The key of Armenia was safe, for there had been no traitors in 1877 to hold back the delivering force, and so the catastrophe of 1855 was not repeated. The middle of July saw the "big battalions" that had marched into Armenia ten weeks before, standing upon the defensive upon their own frontier.

But before the siege of Kars was raised, the Danube had been crossed, and it was confidently predicted that the success of the main army in Europe would more than counterbalance the disasters which the Russian arms had suffered in Asia. Various attempts, more or less serious, had been made to cross the Danube; but a wide river, where every practicable point is watched by a fortress, is a most formidable barrier. At Tchernavoda the Danube, after a course of nearly three hundred miles from Widin, is within thirty-five miles of the sea. Here it suddenly bends to the northward, bending again to the westward at Galatz, and flowing into the delta at Tultscha. The Danube, in its course below Tchernavoda, is divided into several branches, with low, flat islands between them; its banks are marshy, and the district between it and the sea is a malarious tract of low hills, marshy plains, and shallow lakes, containing a number of small villages connected by narrow cart-tracks rather than roads. This is the

district of the Dobrudja, which extends from the delta of the Danube along the coast of the Black Sea as far as Baltjik, a little to the north of Varna. It was into this district that the army of Paskievitch marched in 1828; it was there the disease began in the Russian camps which destroyed three-fourths of the men. The Turks this summer had wisely placed only a small corps of observation in the Dobrudja, and when on June 23rd the Russians, under the command of Zimmermann, bridged the Danube near Galatz, constructed a causeway across the marshes, and occupied Matchin, they met with only a trifling resistance from the Turkish irregulars. The small Turkish army fell back to Tchernavoda, and 60,000 Russians were poured into the malarious fever-land of the Dobrudja.

In 1828 the Russians marched through the Dobrudja because, in consequence of the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Navarino, they had the command of the sea, and were supplied by their Black Sea fleet. This year the Russians had no such reason for the invasion of the Dobrudja. Probably their real objects were (1) to have at least the semblance of a success in Europe as a set-off to Mouktar's victories in Asia; (2) to divert the attention of the Turkish commanders from renewed attempts to be made on the main line of the Danube; (3) they may have hoped to advance rapidly against Silistria or Varna, and to find a feeble or treacherous commandant ready to surrender one of these fortresses, as Yussuf Pasha had surrendered Varna in 1828. If the advance into the Dobrudja was meant for a feint, the very slowness and inactivity of Abdul Kerim prevented him from falling into the snare and diverting any considerable portion of his forces to the eastward. If it was meant for a serious attack, it was an utter failure. Zimmermann has spent four months in the Dobrudja without being able to seriously menace either Silistria or Varna. There was no traitor to open their gates to him, and, in the face of the Turkish army at Shumla, he did not feel himself strong enough to invest either fortress. How many men he has lost by disease in these four months we shall know later on. Up to the present the terrible secrets of the Russian hospitals have been well kept.

On June 27th, four days after the invasion of the Dobrudja, the Russians succeeded in forcing a point on the main line of the Danube. That morning simultaneous attempts to cross were made at Turnu, opposite Nikopol, and at Petroceni, near Sistof, or Sistova. The attempt at Turnu, the more serious of the two, failed; the attempt at Petroceni succeeded. Four thousand men, crossing in large boats, established themselves on the southern bank, repelled an attack from Sistova, and

being continually reinforced from the Roumanian bank, succeeded in occupying the town. In the course of the day a pontoon bridge was established between Simnitsa and Sistova, and the regular passage of the river began. There was undoubtedly carelessness (if not worse) on the part of the commandant of Sistova. He ought to have observed more carefully all movements on the other bank, and prevented even a single battalion from obtaining a footing at Petroceni.

The long narrow bridge at Sistova, with its difficult approaches, was not a rapid means of transit for the Russian armies. On July 1st not more than 60,000 Russians had crossed. On that day the first action was fought in Bulgaria. The Russian advanced guard was pushed forward to the south-east to occupy Biela, a town and bridge on the main road from Rustchuk to Tirnova. The town is covered by the river Jantra and stands on a plateau, which rises steeply from the bank of the stream. It was held by a small Turkish force under Ahmed Eyoub, who successfully kept the Russians at bay till the 3rd, when, finding that they had crossed the river higher up and turned the position, he withdrew from the town. In the course of the next week the Russian force in Bulgaria was more than doubled. On crossing the Danube the Czar had issued a proclamation to the Bulgarians, telling them that he came as a deliverer, and inviting them to rally to the standard of Russia. Almost his first act was to appoint as governor of Bulgaria, Prince Tcherkaski, who had made himself notorious by his sanguinary "reorganization" of Poland, after the rising of 1863-64. Tirnova, the old capital of Bulgaria, which was named as Tcherkaski's residence, was still in Turkish hands. The Czar had yet to conquer the territories he had so summarily assigned to his viceroy. In order to accomplish this conquest he had three courses open to him—(1) to make an attack upon the Turkish quadrilateral; (2) to march to the south-west, force the Etropol Balkan, and turn the main line of the Balkan by marching down the Maritza valley to Adrianople; (3) to make a direct attack on the main chain of the Balkans. If he adopted either the second or the third course, at least half the Russian army would have to remain in Bulgaria to hold Abdul Kerim in check and protect the Russian communications. The first plan, on the other hand, would bring the whole available force into direct collision with the Turkish army, and in the event of success the reduction of the Danube fortresses would afford a secure basis for the further prosecution of the war next year. Had the Czar been actuated solely by military reasons, he would undoubtedly have chosen this plan. Its success was doubtful enough, but at

least it was sound ; there might be failure, there could hardly be anything like utter disaster. But the campaign was to be a political one. The Czar knew perfectly well that before all things it was his interest to finish the war in a single season ; for how could Russia, already on the way to bankruptcy before the war began, stand the strain of a war extending over two years ? Would his own throne be safe if the pressure upon the Russian people continued for so long a time, while the greater portion of the army was abroad ? Circassia had already risen—Would Poland remain quiet ? Afghanistan threatened to become the leader of a sacred war in Asia—Might not the wave of Russian conquest be rolled back to the Ural ? Russia, in fact, was not strong enough for a prolonged conflict, and the Czar and his advisers so despised their enemies that they supposed the war could be finished by September, and that they could safely leave the Danube fortresses untaken, the army of Shumla intact, and make a rush for Adrianople in the hope of producing a panic in the capital, diplomatic intervention, and a peace like that of 1829. The flank march by Sofia would be a long one, would completely divide the Russian army into two portions, separated by a hundred miles of difficult roads, and would give Abdul Kerim the choice of falling upon the covering force in Bulgaria and cutting off the Russians from their communications, or of retiring through the Balkans and interposing himself between Adrianople and the Russian advance. The third plan was therefore adopted, and all was staked upon a bold advance by the Balkan passes to Adrianople. It is possible that the Russian generals had further reason for adopting this plan. The inaction of Abdul Kerim in July was remarkable. His friends urged with some show of reason that his policy of delay was a sound one ; that if he did not risk a general engagement the position of the Russians would be found to become worse from day to day, and that he could choose his own time for acting. But the Sultan and the people alike became tired of this Fabian policy. Alleged proof was laid before the Sultan of treachery on the part of Redif, the war minister, in which Abdul Kerim was implicated. When Redif and Abdul Kerim are brought to trial after the war, we shall learn something of its secret history. Meanwhile we must be content to leave in obscurity the motives which prompted the inaction of the main Turkish army for some weeks after the Danube was crossed.

On the 8th the Russians occupied Tirnova, and the Cossacks were at the foot of the Balkans. On the 16th the Russians improved their position on the Danube by capturing Nikopolis. Two days later their advanced guard occupied the Schipka

Pass. The defence of a mountain-chain is always difficult when the mountaineers do not act as the partisans of the defenders. In this instance General Gourko's vanguard was guided by a number of Bulgarian insurgents over a mountain-path to the eastward of the Schipka, and the pass being attacked at both ends, fell into the hands of the Russians on the 16th. The pass is one of the highest and best in the Balkans—an elevated valley 4,300 feet above the sea, traversed by a good road, which is commanded by two redoubts placed upon lofty spurs of the mountain. From this pass Gourko's corps descended into the valley of Kezanlik, one of the most beautiful regions in Turkey, where roses are grown in millions for the manufacture of perfumes. Reouf Pasha, who commanded a small force in the valley, struggled manfully to check the Russian advance. He was beaten at Yeni Saghra, but refused to retire to Adrianople, and his determination probably saved Turkey, for he gained a few days, during which Suleiman Pasha's army, which had been withdrawn from Montenegro, was landed at Enos, and began to arrive by railway at Adrianople. Suleiman's arrival allayed the panic which was beginning to manifest itself at Constantinople. For the moment, however, throughout Europe, there were few who did not speak of the Ottoman empire as doomed. The general opinion was really an unreasonable one. The Turkish armies were still intact, the military position was sound, and the Russian plan of the campaign extremely rash and tempting disaster. In fact, no sooner had Gourko passed the Balkans than the Turkish position began daily to improve. On the 19th Abdul Kerim was dismissed, and Mehemet Ali appointed to take his place. On the 21st came the first great Turkish victory in Europe, the first battle of Plevna.

As early as July 9th, Osman Pasha had led a Turkish *corps* from Widin and seized Plevna, close in to the right of the Russian line of operations, driving out the few Cossacks that occupied the town. At the time little notice was taken of this move of Osman's, although, later on, it proved to be the act that decided the course of the war in Europe. At Plevna the roads of Western Bulgaria run into a kind of knot, and an army placed there can communicate with both Widin and Sophia on the one hand, and menace Sistova and Nikopolis, or Tirnova, on the other. Attacked there on the 21st by the Russian division of Schilder Schuldner, Osman repulsed the enemy with a loss of 2,000 men, a loss acknowledged in Russian despatches. A week after his victory (on July 28th) Osman attacked and captured Loftcha, a town to the south of Plevna, on the Tirnova road. The Russian staff saw that

every effort should be made to retake Plevna. It was attacked next day by 60,000 men under Krudener and Skobelev; the battle raged till the evening of the 30th. The two outer lines of intrenchments were carried by the Russians, but the Turks retook them, and by nightfall the Russians were retreating in hopeless confusion to Bulgareni, having lost at least 15,000 men in the two days' fighting. On the same day Suleiman attacked and defeated the Russians at Yeni Saghra; the Osmanlis were victorious both north and south of the Balkans. Adrianople was safe. The whole Russian army was in serious peril.

The Czar had refused the co-operation of the Roumanian army at the outset of the campaign. He now asked them to garrison Nikopolis, in order that the Russians there might reinforce Krudener. The Guards were ordered to leave St. Petersburg for Bulgaria, the landwehr were called out throughout all Russia, depriving the farmers of labour in the midst of the harvest, and inflicting a serious loss upon the country. It was anticipated that Osman would attack Bulgareni, but he hardly knew the real extent of his success until the Russians had recovered from the first shock of their defeat. He remained within his works at Plevna, receiving reinforcements from Sophia and bringing down heavy guns from Widin. Meanwhile, Suleiman was steadily recovering the ground occupied by the Russians south of the Balkans, and Mehemet Ali was receiving reinforcements through Varna, new levies from Stamboul, Egyptians from Alexandria, and all Fazli Pasha's corps from Soukhoun Kaleh. On the 11th of August Mehemet fought a serious battle with the Russians near Eski Djuma, and defeated them, taking five guns; on the same day, far away in Transcaucasia, Ismail Pasha crossed the Russian frontier and defeated Tergukasoff at Zaryagla.

By the end of August there was not a Russian south of the Balkans; Suleiman had captured the Schipka village on the 20th, and next day he had begun an attack on the pass, which the Russians have held for week after week, the firing hardly ceasing for a day. Here at least the Russians have shown an admirable pertinacity and the most desperate courage, while Suleiman has wrecked his reputation as a general by continuing the useless carnage instead of leaving a strong detachment to bar the outlet of the pass, and marching into Bulgaria by any of the other mountain roads; thus at once turning the Schipka, and combining his operations with those of his colleagues. Mehemet Ali on the 21st had begun an advance against the Russian left upon the Lom, and driven them from their positions about Popskeui. Finally, on the

last day of the month, Osman had come out of Plevna and defeated a Russian corps at Petichel.

The first week of September saw the Russians driven by Mehemet Ali from all their positions on the Lom, and the Turks were almost in sight of Biela. But the Russians had taken Loftcha on the 5th, and on the 7th, having assembled a Russo-Roumanian army of 110,000 men and 280 guns around Plevna, they began the bombardment which was the prelude of a new attack; on the 11th the attack came, and, after two days' of desperate fighting, the Russians were driven back with a loss of 20,000 men, the heaviest loss they had yet suffered on a single battle-field. The single redoubt of Grivitza, an outwork of Plevna, was all that remained in their hands at the end of the battle. It was now evident that Plevna had been converted into a strong fortress, that could not be carried by a coup-de-main. The defeated army began a regular siege, without, however, being able to really invest the place, for a reinforcement of 15,000 men and more than one convoy of ammunition and provisions were successfully conveyed from Sophia to Plevna by Chefket Pasha. Before these pages are in the hands of our readers, it is probable the Russians will have made another attempt to overpower Osman. It is impossible to predict the result, but the Turks ought to be able to hold their ground. In Asia the Russians having massed 60,000 men at Alexandropol, succeeded, on the 15th, in driving Mouktar from his position on the Aladja Dag. Two months ago this victory would have been of use to Russia. Now it comes too late. Kars cannot be successfully besieged with the terrible Armenian winter so close at hand. Mouktar's defeat is the result of his over-confidence in remaining with his weak force too long upon the frontier in presence of an enemy superior in numbers. His victories had led him into the dangerous error of despising his antagonists.

Such is a brief sketch of the history of the war up to the present day, and of the state of affairs upon the Danube. What does it prove? It shows in the first place that the Turkish soldier is more than equal to the Russian; that he can hold intrenchments against superior numbers, as Osman did at Plevna; that he can storm Russian intrenchments, as Mehemet Ali did at Kishlivour and Karahassankoi. It shows that the Russian army of 1,500,000 men, that we have heard of for the last five years, is a myth, and Russia's military power a sham. Russia, with a population of 80,000,000, has never had more than 400,000 men in the field, if she has ever had as many, while Germany, with a population of 39,000,000, was able to pour more than 800,000 men into France in 1870.

The details of the battles show that the Russian soldiers still fight huddled together in masses, as they did in the Crimea; hence the terrible slaughter at Plevna. The details of their defeats show that they are eminently liable to sudden panic. The war has proved that Turkey is neither dead nor dying. The "sick man" was but another Russian myth. Russia has failed in the first campaign. She has the winter before her. What prospect has she of successfully renewing the conflict in the spring?

The roads of Roumania and Bulgaria will soon be impassable. The rains of autumn will increase tenfold the sickness in the Russian camps. If the invaders remain in Bulgaria, how are they to be fed? How many of them will survive? Von Moltke says of the winter of 1828: "The fall of Varna was most fortunate for the Russians. With Varna and Silistria in their rear, and cut off from the sea, it would have been impossible for them to winter in Bulgaria."* Is not this the position of affairs at this moment? Even if the Russians were upon the sea-coast, they have no fleet to supply them, and they are cut off from the sea by the whole Quadrilateral; they have a Turkish army on either hand, and for every pound of bread, for every truss of fodder, for every box of cartridges, they must depend upon two floating bridges which the storms of autumn will break up again and again. When winter comes, the Danube will be bridged effectually from Widin to the sea by one sheet of ice, but the snow-drifts will make transport as difficult as ever upon the roads, and the Russian army will find that severe cold is as terrible, if not a more terrible, enemy to it than to any other European army. The Russian, accustomed to his small hut at home, which the stove converts into a highly-heated oven, feels the cold of a campaign most acutely. According to Sir Robert Wilson,† no less than 90,000 Russians perished in the winter of 1812, while pursuing the French in their disastrous retreat from Moscow. The small English army in the Crimea, only four miles from its base at Balaclava, was more than decimated by the winter of 1854-55, and barely existed through it. How will the immense Russian army in Bulgaria fare, several hundred miles from its base in Russia, and totally unprepared for a winter campaign? Perhaps it will retire into Roumania; but if it does this, it will effect its retreat across the Danube, only with heavy loss, and will have next year to recommence the campaign against a victorious enemy at the precise point where it began this

* Moltke's "The Russians in Bulgaria and Roumelia in 1828-29."

† "Diary of Campaign of 1812," &c.

year. In any case the hospitals and the graveyards will receive a host of Russian sick and dead. The Russian soldier is not clean in his habits, and neglects the simplest sanitary precautions. Russian camps are always the homes of pestilence. Russian armies lose more men by disease than by the bullet. In 1828, 200,000 Russians entered Turkey; in 1829, at most 15,000 recrossed the Pruth.* Neither the climate of Bulgaria nor the sanitary condition of the Russian soldier has improved much since 1828-29.

We see then no reason to suppose that Russia can have any prospect of renewing the campaign after a winter spent in Bulgaria or in Roumania. To our minds the failure of Russia is practically complete—that is, supposing the question remains entirely a question of Russia's power of attack, against Turkey's power of resistance. Now there arise two important questions which we shall endeavour to answer.

1. Has Russia deserved to fail?

2. Have we reason to rejoice at her failure?

The first question is not difficult to answer, if we approach it in a proper spirit, for the real question that underlies it is this, "Is Russia's war against Turkey a just one?" Now this is purely a judicial question, a question of evidence, on which our judgment must be given in accordance with that Divine law of justice that binds nations as well as men. In a matter like this, feeling or sentiment is the worst of guides, it is a question that we must decide purely as our reason and conscience direct us, putting aside all partisan sympathy for Czar or Sultan, Slav or Turk. It is peculiarly our duty as Catholics when we make our voices heard amongst our countrymen on matters belonging to the region of international politics, to plainly assert the sanctity of the law of nations, and the gravity of the crime committed by him who violates it; for the law of nations is the guarantee of right between peoples, and the practical application to their affairs of the ever-binding commands, "Thou shalt not kill—thou shalt not steal—thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour."

No war is just that does not vindicate a right belonging to him who wages it, which he cannot otherwise effectively assert, or seek to repair a wrong for which he has demanded, and been refused, legitimate satisfaction. Only on these serious grounds can he carry fire and sword into a neighbour's territories, enforcing his demands by slaying with the sword, and destroying or seizing his enemy's property. If then a war is unjust—that is waged without just cause—the aggressor

* Von Moltke's Appendix.

bears false witness against his neighbour by falsely asserting that he has subjected himself to the penalties of war, and commits, upon the widest scale, robbery and murder during the prosecution of the war. The important matter, therefore, to consider is, had Russia just cause for declaring war against Turkey? And in order to decide this matter, we must briefly examine the events that immediately preceded the war. It is now an established fact that Russia has had for years throughout Turkey in Europe a network of secret societies and committees that enabled her, whenever she willed it, to excite serious troubles in the Ottoman empire.* She had further, in the little independent state of Montenegro, the chief revenue of whose Prince avowedly consists of a subvention from St. Petersburg, a natural fortress garrisoned by a warlike race, and placed in the midst of Ottoman territory. Moreover, she had in the governments, if not in the people of Roumania and Servia, secret allies, whose ambition made them her tools, whenever she chose to transmit her orders to them. Finally, under the weak rule of the last years of Abdul Aziz, her ambassador at Constantinople obtained such an influence over Mahmoud Nedim Pasha, the Grand Vizier, that, according to Mr. Gallenga (a Russophile writer, if there is one in all Europe), during this, the worst and weakest period of Turkish rule, General Ignatieff had more weight in the direction of affairs than any man in Turkey.† With these means of action in her hands, Russia had at any moment the power of exciting civil war in the Turkish empire.

The Russian army was mobilized in November, 1876, on the eve of the Conference. Up to that time every armed attack on Turkey had failed. A peaceful and legal revolution in the capital had swept away Abdul Aziz and Mahmoud Nedim, the tool of Ignatieff, and after Mourad VII., the next in legal succession, had been found hopelessly imbecile, his brother, Abdul Hamid II., the son of Abdul Medjid, was placed upon the throne. The insurrection in the Herzegovina had never spread beyond the frontier districts adjacent to Montenegro, and the rising in Bulgaria had been trampled out, the irregulars who suppressed it exacting fearful reprisals for the deeds of outrage and bloodshed with which the rebels, led by the Pan Slavist agitators, had begun the insurrection.‡ Montenegro had declared

* See Mr. Baring's report on the events in Bulgaria, and the documentary evidence collected by Lord R. Montagu in his seventh chapter.

† "Two Years of the Eastern Question." By A. Gallenga. London: 1877.

‡ Apart from the documentary evidence in Mr. Baring's report that the atrocities were begun by the Bulgars, we have indirect testimony as to the

war, with the object of annexing a portion of the Herzegovina, but the operations of the Montenegrin army had been almost entirely confined to the district of Nicksics. Serbia had declared war against her suzerain, although for fifty years she had enjoyed complete independence of Turkey, and for three years the Turkish garrisons had been withdrawn from her fortresses on the distinct pledge that these fortresses should not be used as a base of operations against Turkey. Russia, without a declaration of war, sent her soldiers into Serbia to fight against the Turks, with whom she was professedly at peace. But even this most flagrant outrage against the law of nations availed her nothing. The Russo-Servian army was defeated in the field. On October 30th the camp of Alexinatz was stormed by the Turkish army, and Serbia was granted an armistice.

Her war in disguise, her war of insurrection, having failed, Russia prepared for a more serious and open conflict by mobilizing her army, and concentrating 400,000 men on the Turkish frontiers; at the same time expressing her hope that the Conference, which was to assemble at Constantinople, would find a peaceful solution for the Eastern Question. In his famous speech at Moscow on the 10th of November the Czar said:—

In a few days negotiations will commence in Constantinople, between the representatives of the Great Powers, to settle the conditions of peace. My most ardent wish is, that we may arrive at a general agreement. Should this, however, not be achieved, and should I see that we cannot obtain such guarantees as are necessary for carrying out what we have a right to demand of the Porte, I am firmly determined to act independently, and I am convinced that in this case the whole of Russia will respond to my summons should I consider it necessary, and should the honour of Russia require it. May God help us to carry out our sacred mission!

To the menaces of Russia the Sultan, Abdul Hamid, and his ministers replied by quietly and unostentatiously completing the defences of Turkey, whilst, in order to more than anticipate every just demand, they opened negotiations for peace with Montenegro and Serbia, elaborated a form of representative government for the empire, and a constitution which declared Moslem and Christian, Turk, Greek, and Slav, equal before the law, under the common name of Ottomans. On the

character of these people, and the probability of their insurrections being accompanied with massacre and outrage, in the detailed narratives of the atrocities committed by them during the summer campaign,—narratives written by independent witnesses of different nationalities, and of various shades of political opinion.

23rd of November the Conference met at Constantinople, and while the ambassadors and envoys were exchanging their credentials, the windows of the palace in which they met were shaken by the roar of a hundred guns which saluted the proclamation of the Turkish Constitution. The demands of Russia, as formulated by the Conference, were of a nature to destroy once and for ever the authority of the Sultan, his ministers, and his Parliament. They included the institution of a permanent International Commission to supervise the affairs of Turkey; the occupation of whole territories by foreign troops, or foreign gendarmerie; the withdrawal of the Turkish troops to the fortresses; the removal to Asia of the Circassians whom Russia had driven from their homes in the Caucasus, and now sought to drive from their new homes in Europe; the placing of certain districts under the administration of Servia and Montenegro; finally, interference on the part of foreign powers in the appointment of governors of provinces, in the administration of the finances, and in the judicial system of the country. The Turkish ministers might well have refused to listen for a moment to such proposals, backed as they were by the menace of the camp at Kischeneff. But they discussed them with the other plenipotentiaries, pointed out how far reforms, already effected by Abdul Hamid, had gone to remedy evils that might have existed under Abdul Aziz, reforms which were only a portion of those to be carried into effect in every department when the Parliament met; and sought to find a basis upon which an agreement as to the future might be framed, which would not be fatal at once to the honour and independence of the State. No such basis was found. On January 18th the demands of the Conference were laid before the Grand Council of Turkey, an assembly of 240 notables, in which were represented not only the Moslems, but the Christian communities of every nationality. The Council was unanimous in rejecting the Russian demands. It was the first time it had met since the Crimean war. It proved that Turkey was united in its loyalty to its sovereign, and that so far as their representatives could speak for them, the Christian communities neither asked nor desired the protection of Russia.*

* Last April, a deputy from Kurdistan, speaking in the Ottoman Parliament, expressed the spirit which animated the people of the Empire in a few words, to which their simple, earnest truth gave the grace of the highest eloquence. "I myself," he said, "like most of the people of my province, go about in rags, and it was only by a great effort and sacrifice that I have been able to get this coat to appear decently among you; and still I am ready to give up this coat and resume my old rags in order to fight for the

On the eve of the failure of the Conference Lord Derby had telegraphed to Lord Salisbury that it was desirable that no "identical note or protocol" embodying the demands of the Conference should be signed, and that he should avoid any language "that could be construed as pledging Her Majesty's Government to enforce the proposals of the Conference."* The day after the rejection of these proposals, Prince Gortchakoff sent a circular to the Powers,† in which he said: "It is necessary for us to know what the cabinets with whom we have hitherto acted in common propose to do with a view of meeting this refusal, and insuring the execution of their wishes." The final outcome of this circular was the London Protocol of March 31st. The question we have before us is simply, was Russia's proclamation of war a just one? The history of the London Protocol answers it, and that history, based on the English Blue Books, is to be found set forth at length in Lord Robert Montagu's fourteenth chapter.‡ We can only give it in outline here.

On February 29th our ambassador at St. Petersburg communicated to Prince Gortchakoff the resolution of the English Government to defer any reply to his circular of January 19th. "Prince Gortchakoff," says Lord A. Loftus, "appeared to view the postponement of an answer to his circular with regret. He said that the present position of affairs was extremely prejudicial to Russia; that the mobilization of the army cost 13,000,000 monthly; and that a prolonged delay in ascertaining the decision of the European Powers imposed on Russia a costly sacrifice." Lord A. Loftus then, in accordance with his instructions, pointed out that "the greater portion of the reforms recommended by the Conference had been accepted by the Porte, and harmonized with the Constitution which had been proclaimed. It was reasonable, therefore, for Europe to grant a certain respite to the Porte to enable it to prove its sincerity in the assurances given. A period of twelve months would enable the Porte to give evidence of its determination to carry out the proposed reforms. Prince Gortchakoff replied that Russia could not wait for twelve or even six months with the military cost she was now incurring.

existence and honour of my country. No one has a right to interfere with our own domestic affairs, and we Ottomans protest solemnly against such interference by any foreign power." These words were addressed to a mixed assembly of Christians and Moslems, and they hailed them with enthusiastic cheers.

* Blue Book II. of 1877, No. 147, Jan. 8, and No. 188, Jan. 13.

† Blue Book VIII. of 1877, No. 1.

‡ "England and the Eastern Question," pp. 321, &c.

The reforms, he observed, could be perfectly inaugurated within two months."* Lord R. Montagu calls attention to the fact that Russia waited just two months after this important conversation before she began the war.

Next day Lord Derby writes to Lord A. Loftus, that Count Schouvaloff had called upon him and said that:—

The Russian Government were in a position of considerable difficulty. The expense and inconvenience of keeping up their armaments on the present footing was very great, and could not be continued indefinitely. On the other hand, unless public opinion could be satisfied by the announcement of some specific advantage that had been gained by the armament, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to proceed to demobilize the forces which had been placed on a war footing.†

In a second despatch of the same date‡ Lord Derby informs Lord A. Loftus—

That it is understood by Her Majesty's Government that the object of the Russian Government is to secure an honourable retreat from their present position.

Then came the proposal (says Lord R. Montagu) to sign an identic note—a Protocol of the joint demands on Turkey (which Lord Derby and the British Cabinet had said "was to be by all means avoided"). It was an ultimatum to be presented to Turkey by "United Europe"; and, of course, it was an admission by all Europe of the justice of Russia's demands. It was, therefore, an annihilation of the treaty of March, 1856, and of the tripartite treaty of April, 1856. It is General Ignatieff who is told off to do this duty. How admirably he does it! The most refined insinuations! the most natural conclusions from the principle which Gortchakoff had established.

It was, of course (said General Ignatieff), impossible for Russia to disarm unless the Government could show the people that something had been obtained as a return for the expense of the mobilization of the army; in fact, that Russia and the rest of Europe had not been actually set at naught by the Porte, and that some security had been obtained for the improvement of the condition of the Christians in Turkey. The Conference had separated at Constantinople without drawing up a final Protocol. But this omission might be remedied. A Protocol might now be signed embodying the reforms ultimately recommended by the Conference, and requiring the Porte to execute them. . . . General Ignatieff's language implied that, on the signature of such a Protocol, Russia would place her army on a peace footing again, but he did not say this in so many words.‡

The principle of the Protocol was agreed to by a cabinet council on March 13th. This principle was that the European

* Blue Book XVI. of 1877, No. 236.

† Id. XV. of 1877, No. 167.

‡ Id. XV. of 1877, No. 168.

‡ Id. XV. of 1877, No. 247, Lord Lyons, March 9.

powers were as a united body to lay down a programme of reforms to be put into effect by Turkey; to watch the progressive execution of these reforms, and to take common action in the event of Turkey failing to execute them. The bait which Russia held out to the English cabinet in order to secure its signature was disarmament. Yet when, on March 31st the Protocol was actually signed which called upon the Porte to make peace with Montenegro, disarm in the presence of a Russian army on its frontiers, and, under the penalty of war, carry into effect a programme of reform drawn up for it by foreign governments, Russia gave no distinct pledge that she would demobilize her army. The note appended by Count Schouvaloff to the Protocol only declared that if Turkey would make peace with Montenegro, and take the advice of Europe, showing itself ready to replace its army on a peace footing, and to carry out the reforms named in the Protocol, it should "send to St. Petersburg a special envoy to treat of disarmament," to which the Emperor would consent; but it was added that if any more atrocities occurred in Turkey, the demobilization would necessarily not be carried out. Now Russia could prevent, and did prevent, Montenegro making peace with Turkey; therefore, she had the diplomatic game in her own hands,* and Count Schouvaloff's note was really a demand that Turkey should either suffer a Russian invasion, or by disarming place herself at the mercy of the Russian army. What was the attitude assumed by Turkey in reference to these high-handed demands?

While the negotiations for the signature of the Protocol were in progress at London, and the Porte having already granted a most generous peace to Servia, was endeavouring to come to terms with Montenegro, the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs had an interview with the English *chargé d'affaires* at Constantinople on March 14. The Minister said:—

That he was fully alive to the danger of war with Russia arising from a renewal of hostilities with the Principality [Montenegro], and to the fearful consequences which such a conflict might involve, and he expressed a hope that, in the interests of all, the Powers would impose their will on the Prince

* On April 4th Lord A. Loftus, according to instructions from Lord Derby, told Prince Gortchakoff that the British Government had learned that the decision of the Prince of Montenegro depended upon the message he might receive from St. Petersburg (XV. of 1877, No. 517). On the same day Lord Derby telegraphed to our minister at Vienna and to Lord A. Loftus, that the Prince of Montenegro would not give way, "as he would wait until the 5th to learn from Russia," &c., and that "the Prince's decision appears to depend upon Russia" (XV. of 1877, Nos. 457 and 459).

of Montenegro to dissuade him from demanding concessions which could not be granted. That in any case Turkey, while maintaining a sufficient force to keep Montenegro in check, was willing to offer most solemn assurances of her readiness to execute all the reforms which had been accepted by her in the Conference, and that if she could obtain from any of the great Powers a reasonable security against attack from Russia, she would not hesitate to disarm immediately.*

On the receipt of the Protocol the Porte sent to its diplomatic agents abroad a circular in which it expressed its regret that Turkey had been allowed no voice in the negotiation at London, and protested against the proceedings as a dangerous precedent to introduce into the relations of nations with each other. It pointed to the reforms already effected or in progress as evidence of its desire to afford every just satisfaction to the Powers. It denied, however, that they could have any claim to place Turkey under international supervision. As to the peace with Montenegro, it asserted that Turkey had offered to Prince Nikita a liberal rectification of frontiers, and that it was only his exorbitant claims that delayed an agreement. As for disarmament, Turkey was ready to follow the example of Russia if the Czar would order a demobilization. It was Count Schouvaloff's declaration annexed to the Protocol that provoked the greatest resistance on the part of the Porte. On the 5th of April our *chargé d'affaires* at Constantinople telegraphed to Lord Derby:—

The Minister for Foreign Affairs stated to me this morning, in the presence of the Grand Vizier, as the expression of his personal opinion, that should Russia consent to withdraw the Declaration, and to leave the question of territorial cession to Montenegro open till later, when he hoped for an amicable arrangement, *he would undertake not only that the required reforms should be seriously carried out, but that the refugees should be re-established to the satisfaction of Prince Nicholas, and that an envoy should be sent to St. Petersburg to treat of reciprocal disarmament.*†

The Turks were thus ready to make any reasonable concession. The real difficulty in the way of peace was upon the other side. The next morning (April 6th) at St. Petersburg, Prince Gortchakoff plainly told our ambassador that Russia could no longer bear the strain of keeping the army mobilized and idle; that the question of peace and war had reached its eleventh hour, and that the Emperor would not recede from the position he had taken up.‡ Prince Gortchakoff might have added that Russia was at that very moment arranging

* Id., XV. of 1877, No. 286.

† Id., XV. of 1877, No. 518.

‡ Id., XV. of 1877, No. 471.

with Roumania the treaty which was to make the principality her base of operations against its suzerain.

On the 13th the armistice with Montenegro expired; on the 24th, after a few days of hesitation, Russia began the war. In his manifesto the Czar proclaimed that the non-acceptance of the Protocol was the cause of the war. In their circular to the Great Powers on the declaration of war, the ministers of the Sultan asked what injuries Russia had received from Turkey—plainly none, for she alleged none—the only pretext for war was that the Porte refused to accept Count Schouvaloff's declaration, and to give those guarantees enumerated in the Protocol, which would have destroyed its independence by placing it under the tutelage of foreign Governments.

As she agrees with the Great Powers, they said, as to the most essential parts of the reforms, the Sublime Porte asks whether Russia is justified in declaring war against the Ottoman empire in the name of a document which, according to the declaration made at the time of its signature, was to be of value only so long as war should not break out; in having recourse to arms alone, of all the signatories of the Protocol; in attributing to the declaration of Count Schouvaloff a character binding on all the signatories of the Protocol; in making war in the name of the general peace; in letting loose upon all the people, Mussulman and Christian, of the Ottoman empire, frightful calamities to better ensure their welfare; finally, in endangering the integrity and independence of the empire in search of the conditions of its prosperity?"*

From this series of facts and documents it appears that Russia, having failed to break up Turkey by the Servian war, mobilized her army on the eve of the Conference; that she refused to recognize the reforms actually in progress in Turkey, and endeavoured to force upon the Porte a programme drawn up without its concurrence and consent; that she alleged that she could not disarm unless the Protocol were signed, and then used it as a pretext for war; that she insisted on Turkey making peace with Montenegro, as a preliminary to disarmament, and then refused to exert her influence to make Prince Nicholas accept the concessions offered to him; that when it was suggested she should wait a year or six months to witness the execution of the reforms in Turkey, she refused to wait, and did not wait more than two months, alleging the expense of the mobilization as a motive for precipitating the war; that from the outset she was resolved on war, and prolonged the negotiations only in the hope of either obtaining the submission of the Porte without having recourse to arms, or making

* *Id.*, XXV. of 1877, No. 140, pp. 89, 90.

the other Powers her accomplices. Finally, it is clear that Turkey has made, or was prepared to make, the largest concessions compatible with her existence as an independent Power. We have given evidence on all these points: still further evidence is to be found in abundance in the long series of documents collected and analyzed by Lord Robert Montagu.

On these facts only one judgment is possible: Russia's war against Turkey is in the highest degree unnecessary and unjust. She deserved to fail. She has failed. Her armies had hardly crossed the Pruth when Pius IX. told the pilgrims of Savoy that God's hand would be heavy on Russia. His words, read in the light of the last five months, seem like a prophecy.

Apart, then, from all questions of interest, we have good cause to rejoice at the failure of Russia, because it is the failure of an unjust, and therefore a most wicked enterprise. But, having said this much, we may ask ourselves if, from the point of view of interest, we have not also good cause to rejoice at the heavy blow which has been dealt to the power of Russia? To this question we must reply in the affirmative, and chiefly upon two grounds:—(1) Russia is an aggressive Power, and a danger to Europe, whilst Turkey is non-aggressive, and a safeguard to Europe; (2) Russia is a persecuting Power, while Turkey is essentially tolerant, and the protector of our brethren in the East. We must enlarge a little upon these two points.

There is a document in existence which every student of diplomatic history knows, or ought to know, well—the so-called will of Peter the Great. Its authenticity has been disputed, and much can be said for and against it, but it really matters very little whether the Czar Peter wrote it or not. It is certainly a century old, and it sets forth the policy which has been consistently followed by the cabinet of St. Petersburg from the times of Peter the Great to our own. This is its chief value, and it is a value that is independent of its authorship. The policy of Russia, as set forth in that document, is a policy of aggression, the history of Russia since the days of Peter the Great is a history of conquest. But Russian aggression is not a mere brutal force hurled against its victim to win its way by fire and steel. Invariably diplomacy has gone before it to prepare the road. The public opinion of other nations has been conciliated by alleging high motives, and the support of foreign cabinets has been secured by playing upon their self-interest, their ignorance, or their fears. Why did Russia partition Poland? To put an end to

a reign of anarchy. Why has she overrun Central Asia, and massacred the Turkomans? To promote the interests of science and civilization. Why has she invaded Turkey? To protect the Christians. All these are most disinterested acts—enterprises undertaken in the interest of Europe, and of the world. How was she able to conquer Poland? Through having for her open accomplices and fellow-robbers Prussia and Austria. How did she extort from Turkey an ignominious peace in 1829? Through the ignorance, the timidity, or the treachery of the ambassadors of the powers at Constantinople, who induced the Porte to sue for peace at the very moment when Diebitch's army was utterly exhausted and helpless.* How has she established herself in Central Asia? Through the apathy and ignorance of Europe, which allowed her to secure a base of operations on the Caspian by the conquest of the Caucasus.† How did she hope to succeed in the present war upon Turkey? By taking advantage of the divisions which we know from undoubted evidence that her diplomatists and her agents had brought about within the Ottoman Empire. What barrier has Russia ever allowed to stand in her way? Has she respected the law of nations? Let her secret war in Serbia, carried on by her own troops, while she claimed to be at peace with Turkey, be the answer. Has she respected treaties? If so, where are the treaties of 1856? Has she ever been bound by the pledged word of her sovereign? If so, it is strange that she holds Khiva. And what has been the result of this policy of aggression? In 1700, Russia was the Grand Duchy of Muscovy, a half-Slav half-Tartar State, with its capital Moscow, and an ill-defined territory, which, to the south and east, was shut in by the steppes of the Cos-

* Von Moltke estimates Diebitch's effective force at Adrianople at between 4,000 and 5,000 men. "Such," he says, "was the army which was to make head against 30,000 Arnauts, to keep in subjection a town of 80,000 inhabitants, and to conquer another city of 500,000. On the 14th of September peace was signed. It is certain that it released Diebitch from a position as anxious as could well be conceived, and which, if prolonged for a few days more, might have caused him to be hurled from the summit of victory and success to the lowest depths of ruin and destruction" (Von Moltke, chap. v.).

† The *Moscow Gazette* of September 3rd, 1864, in announcing the completion of the conquest of Circassia, said:—"The establishment of foreign dominion in the Caucasus would have settled once for all the Asiatic question, and settled it against us. The complete and definite establishment of Russian dominion in the Caucasus has not only prevented such dangers, but has decided the future in our favour. By that final conquest of these mountains, the army of the Caucasus has become free, and the limits of Russian ambition now depend on the will of Russia alone. The possession of them shelters Central Asia not only from the action, but from the irreverent gaze of Europeans."

sacks and the Turkomans, and, to the northward, had on the White Sea the single port of Archangel, that was frozen for half the year. Nowhere else but on the Arctic Ocean had it a single mile of seaboard. What is Russia now? It is a gigantic empire that extends from the islands of Japan, and the valley of the Chinese Amur, to the frontiers of Afghanistan, the southern shores of the Caspian, the plain of the Vistula, the coasts of the Baltic. A glance at a map of the world is enough to show what mighty strides this half-barbarous State has made in less than two centuries. She has set no limit to her progress. Popular writers in Russia tell their countrymen that "*youthful Russia is destined to regenerate the world*"; that "*if Europe, the decrepit old man, will not die, young Russia must strangle him.*" We may call this wild folly, utter madness, but this madman, Russia, has strangled Poland, and only just failed to strangle the Ottoman Empire.

Now let us look at Turkey. What has her history been for the last one hundred and fifty years? Has she attempted a single conquest? Has she so much as wished for any? Has she ever drawn the sword except in self-defence? To these three questions the answer must be "*no.*" Whatever the Turks were three hundred years ago, they are to-day eminently peaceful and unaggressive. The wish for war, for military glory, for foreign conquest, is quite alien to the spirit of the people. They ask only to be let alone. They have sufficient confidence in the prowess of their armies, they know enough of their own military history, to be quite impervious to the temptation that has more than once driven the French, Austrians, and Germans into war. Their fundamental laws make a war of aggression all but impossible. No war can be declared until the *Sheik-ul-Islam*—the supreme head of the Turkish law—has examined into its causes, and by a *fetva*, or solemn decree, declared it just. Even when the country is invaded, no Turkish troops can march against the enemy, and not a shot can be fired unless in direct reply to hostile fire, until the *Sheik-ul-Islam* has been consulted, and his *fetva* has declared the war a just one.* It is as if with us no war could be declared without the solemn judgment of the Lord Chief

* "Sitting with some soldiers at a bivouac fire, one of them was recounting how, at the opening of the campaign of 1828, the perfidious Muscovites had established themselves on the Turkish territory, and were pushing their works up to a small fort where he was in garrison. On which, I asked how they could be such fools as not to attack, and drive them back. He answered 'War had not been declared.' I laughed. Upon this, he leaped up, and ran for his musket. I thought he was going to use it against me, but he kissed the stock, and said—'God puts this in my hand, and I will not use it save with His blessing.'"—*The East and the West*, p. 201.

Justice of England. The Turk, according to the popular idea, is a terrible man with a yataghan, with which he is anxious to have a chance of cutting off some one's head. The real Turk is a man whose military history for a century and a half is the history of none but defensive wars, and whose laws are specially framed to prevent aggression. But while Turkey threatens no one, the valour of her people makes her a terrible barrier to the progress of Russia.

Turkey holds in Constantinople, the waters of the Sea of Marmora, and the straits which give access to them on either side, a military and maritime position which, in the hands of an aggressive power, would be an impregnable fortress and a secure base of operations against both Europe and Asia. The great highways of the world, the Euphrates valley, the Suez Canal, the Mediterranean, the Danube valley, lie close around it. Its possession by Turkey cuts off Russia from the Mediterranean, and from Western Asia. So long as she keeps the Dardanelles, the naval power of Russia is but a name. Standing sword in hand on the hills of Armenia and the shores of the Danube, and holding with their fleets the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, the Turks keep back from Europe and Asia the aggression of Russia. Themselves eminently peaceful and unaggressive, they are guarding all Europe against a Power that for two hundred years by her soldiers and her diplomatists has been unceasingly busy removing her neighbours' landmarks and absorbing their territories. We have good cause then to rejoice at the defeat of Russia, because it is the defeat of the aggressor, the violator of treaties, the despiser of international law, because it is the first great blow that has checked, and that, if Europe is not lost for ever by its own folly, will finally stop a lawless career of conquest.

So much for the first point ; let us now turn to the second. Russia is a persecutor, the only nation in Europe that in our day still persecutes the Church of God by slaying its sons with the sword and torturing them with the lash. The whole theory of Government and internal policy in Russia is based upon the principle that the Czar is the oracle of God, and no man can be in the full sense of the word a loyal subject of Russia unless he accepts this theory. "The will of the Emperor," says Count Gurowski, "is the most literal expression of Divine Order transmitted to the earth, his Imperial person is recognized as the living head of the State and of the Church, and his decision no written word of the past can bind."* No man can be in the fullest sense of the word a

* "Russia and Civilization." St. Petersburg, 1840.

Russian unless he is a member of the Orthodox Church, it is, therefore, the interest of the Government to enforce orthodoxy in so far as this can be safely done by a policy of persecution, and this theory has been reduced to practice in many parts of the Russian dominions. Poland has felt the full brunt of the sword of persecution. By the sixth article of the treaty of partition of 1773, Russia bound herself to "leave the Catholics of both rites* in *statu quo*, that is, in the free exercise of their worship (*culte*) and discipline, and never to avail itself of its rights of supremacy to the prejudice of the *status in quo* of the Roman Catholic Church." Despite this solemn engagement, Catherine, Nicholas, and the present Czar Alexander II. used the bayonet, the whip, exile to Siberia, deprivation of food, exposure to the winter cold, as so many engines for forcing the Catholics of Poland and chiefly those of the Uniat rite into conformity with the State Church. Till the day when the iniquities of all time are unveiled in the last great judgment, the true story of the Polish persecution will not be known. At times the veil that hides it is lifted for a moment, and we have a passing glimpse of Russia's "good deeds" in the diffusion of Czarodoxy among her subjects. Such a glimpse was given to Europe when the abbess Makrina escaped from her Russian prison and told the terrible story of the nuns of Minsk. We have another glimpse in Colonel Mansfield's official despatches from Warsaw which describe the persecution as it was carried on within the last three years.† Nor has the policy of persecution been confined to Poland or exercised only upon Catholics. Mr. Tracy Turnerelli, in one of his works on Russia, tells how he himself saw in the province of Kazan several hundred of the people of the Steppe collected together and baptized under the gentle persuasion of the Cossack whips, these military missionaries being supported by a column of troops with light field guns, which were kept ready to open fire on the peasants in the

* Viz., the Latin and the Greek Uniat rites—both in communion with the Holy See.

† "Blue Book." Russia. No. 1, of 1877. A single extract from this "Blue Book" will suffice to show the character of the persecution. On January 29th, 1874, Colonel Mansfield writes from Warsaw:—"In the district of Minciewicz the peasants surrounded the Church, and defied the military to introduce the (Russian) priest. The former, with their wives and children, were finally mastered and surrounded, and were given the option of signing a declaration accepting the priest; on their refusal fifty blows with the *nagaika* (Cossack whip) were given to every adult man, twenty-five to every woman, and ten to every child irrespective of age or sex; one woman who was more vehement than the rest receiving as much as one hundred."

event of their resisting the wholesale baptism offered them by the agents of the Czar.

While in Russia we see the orthodox religion thus enforced upon Catholic Poles and Pagan nomads alike with the sword, in Turkey we witness a universal toleration, while Catholicity receives more than toleration—the highest marks of respect from the State. Last Corpus Christi the procession of the Blessed Sacrament was escorted through the streets of Constantinople by Turkish troops. A priest, or a sister of charity, is invariably saluted by the sentinel on passing a Turkish post. The patriarchs and bishops are supported by the State, not only in the spiritual, but to a certain extent in the civil, government of their flocks, which is largely in their hands. One solitary episode has marred this universal toleration—the so-called Armenian persecution. The acts of persecution committed by the Ottoman Government consisted of the exile of the patriarch, and the handing over of some of the churches to the schismatic Armenians. The pamphlet, which we have named at the head of this article, "*Le Schisme Arménien*," gives proofs and documents which show plainly that on this occasion the Porte departed from its traditional policy of toleration under foreign influence; partly that of the French ambassador and a knot of Liberal Catholics, who were anxious to see a species of Dollingerism raising its head amongst the Armenians; partly that of Russia, who had good reason to fear Mgr. Hassoun, and part of whose policy it is to withdraw the Armenians from their allegiance to Rome, and to make them look to her own synod as the source of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. For details on these matters we must refer to the work we have cited. We cannot go more fully into the matter here; another time we may return to it. Meanwhile, we need only remark that, compared to Russia's persecutions in Poland, the Armenian persecution was slight indeed; and, such as it was, it is now at an end; Mgr. Hassoun is again at Constantinople, the centre of the Armenian rite, and we have the best authority for stating that he has expressed himself as being "very well satisfied with the situation of affairs." Everywhere the Catholics have shown by their loyalty, in the most trying circumstances, that they are contented with rule of the Porte. They have not given any aid to the insurrections organized by Russia in Bosnia or the Herzegovina and Bulgaria,* and the "Blue Books" show that, though legally

* The following is the text of the manifesto issued by the Catholics of Bosnia on the outbreak of the Servian war:—"The announcement that Serbia has demanded from the Sublime Porte the annexation of Bosnia, our dear country, has surprised us as much as a flash of lightning in a clear sky.

exempt from military service, they have freely given volunteers and money to aid in the defence of the empire. They know perfectly well that the Turkish sword is all that stands between them and the fate that has overtaken the Catholics of Poland. It is easy enough to say that Russia wished to place the cross on the dome of S. Sophia. We reply, the cross must not be placed there by hands that dishonour it—the hands of the persecutor red with the blood of the sons of the cross. In the interest of our brethren living in the Turkish empire, we rejoice at the defeat of Russia, and we are glad that at least a few Christian swords have flashed in the gallant ranks that have inflicted defeat and dishonour upon the arch-persecutor of the Church of God.

We do not sympathize with those who long to see the Turk driven out of Europe. He holds his present position in Europe in virtue of treaty rights and solemn obligations. That these should be violated at all is bad enough, but it is a fearful evil that they should be violated under pretext of promoting Christianity. The venerable Las Casas, the first bishop who ever ruled a Christian flock in the New World, in a disputation with Sepulveda, a theologian, of Valladolid, who attempted to justify the Spanish wars in America, urged, as one of many reasons against these wars, "that by them the faith was brought into ill-repute with the unbelievers, and made odious to them, which was a very great evil." There is only too much reason to fear that the unjust aggression of Russia, made in the outraged name of Christianity, will have this effect in the East, and will put back the cause of Christianity in Turkey for a hundred years. Of all the mad cries which this miserable war has called forth, what we may call the "crusading cry" seems to us the most insane. The only possible effect of driving out the Turks would be to place the Greek Church and the Bulgarian Church under the headship of Russia; to give power and *prestige* to the schisms of the East, and to bring in a few years a fierce persecution down upon the heads of the Catholic Latin and Oriental rites.

The war has destroyed many illusions, and brought many facts to light. It has proved that, on a fair field, the Turk

We Catholics of Bosnia, to the number of 200,000 souls, having remained loyal to our legitimate government (the Porte) during the whole of the insurrectionary movement, feel ourselves obliged by the conduct of Serbia to formally declare that we protest absolutely against our annexation to Serbia; and this not for reasons drawn from the interests of civilization, but on religious grounds, for the name of Serbia is identical with that of Greek schismatic, and although there is in Serbia a sufficiently numerous body of Catholics, yet, with the exception of one consular chapel and chaplain, there does not exist in Serbia a Catholic church or a Catholic priest."

can defeat the Russian. It has proved that the Bulgar lives in a state of prosperity that the Russian mujik might envy.* Finally it has proved that, excepting those sects which Russia has made her dupes and allies, the Christians are loyal to the Porte, and this is eminently true of our own brethren in Turkey. We have heard much of Turkish misrule, but we have learned by the evidence of facts that the rule of the Porte is not unpopular with the great mass of its subjects. We do not assert that it is a model government; but what we do assert is, that the abuses of Turkish rule pressed as heavily and often more heavily upon the Moslem than upon the Christian, and now Moslem and Christian are uniting in an earnest effort to lessen abuses, and to place the affairs of the country upon a secure basis; and the war, though it has retarded, has not stopped the prosecution of their endeavours to attain this end. It is in the midst of these efforts that they have had to draw the sword in order to defend their existence as a nation against a lawless brigandage, to which, if men judged of the acts of nations as they do of those of individuals, they would not venture to give the name of war.

* We have this on the authority of Russian journalists, and of the correspondents of our own press of all shades of opinion.

ART. VI.—CATHOLICITY AND NATIONAL PROSPERITY.

Protestantism and Catholicity in their Bearing upon the Liberty and Prosperity of Nations. A study in Social Economy, by ÉMILE DE LAVELEYE, with an introductory letter by the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. London : Murray. 1875.

De l'Avenir des Peuples Catholiques, par le Baron de HAULLEVILLE. 2me édition. Paris : Ch. Bleriot. 1876.

Essays and Reviews, by the Right Rev. J. L. SPALDING, D.D., Bishop of Peoria. New York : Catholic Publication Society. 1877.*

WHEN Macaulay in his famous essay on the Popes confessed that Protestantism had not given "any proofs of that expansive power which had been attributed to it," that it had actually lost many of its first conquests in Europe, that for two hundred and fifty years, "as far as there had been a change, that change had upon the whole been in favour of the Church of Rome," he endeavoured to offer some consolation to his Protestant readers, by asserting that Protestantism had been practically proved to be more conducive to a nation's prosperity than Catholicism. "It cannot be doubted," he said, "that since the sixteenth century the Protestant nations have made decidedly greater progress than their neighbours. The progress made by those nations in which Protestantism, though not finally successful, yet maintained a long struggle, and left permanent traces, has generally been considerable. But, when we come to the Catholic Land, to the part of Europe in which the first spark of Reformation was trodden out as soon as it appeared, and from which proceeded the impulse that drove Protestantism back, we find at best a very slow progress, and on the whole a retrogression." And he added :—"Our firm belief is that the North owes its great civilization and prosperity chiefly to the moral effect of the Protestant Reformation, and that the decay of the Southern countries of Europe is to be mainly ascribed to the great Catholic revival."

Such as it is, this consolation is but a poor one. Want

* Since this article was written our attention has been called to Bishop Spalding's admirable reply to Mr. de Laveleye, reprinted in his *Essays and Reviews*. We have occasionally referred to it, or taken extracts from it in the notes to our article.

of expansive power and inability to make new conquests are not the marks of the true Church. *Veritas prævalebit* is an adage which has been thoroughly falsified by facts, if Protestantism has truth upon its side. But, says Lord Macaulay, the truth is prevailing in another fashion. The people of Protestant countries are rich, progressive, intelligent, and this mainly on account of the Reformation, while Catholicity has a contrary tendency, and leads to "at best very slow progress, and on the whole a retrogression." This idea has always been a favourite one with Protestant writers, and of late years it has been adopted by the Liberals and freethinkers of the Continent as a thesis which they suppose they can maintain with good results to their cause. Here they say we have proof that Catholic nations can only be prosperous in spite of their Catholicity, and if you are a good Catholic you are at the same time a bad patriot. In support of this thesis they compare Protestant and Catholic nations always to the disadvantage of the latter; not that they have any particular affection for Protestantism, but they remember Edgar Quinet's advice, that in the war with Catholicity they should ally themselves with all that is not Catholic.

M. Emile de Laveleye, professor of political economy in the Liberal University of Liège, and known to English readers by an occasional contribution to the "Fortnightly" edits an ultra-Liberal periodical, the "Revue de Belgique." This review has made itself a power among the *gueux*, the "anti-Clerical" party in Belgium, by its persistent attacks upon the Catholic Church. Not long ago one of the youngest of its contributors, M. Perganani, ventured to assert that force was the source of right, and that as argument produced no effect upon the Catholics, and it was impossible to contend with them on equal terms, the Liberals of Belgium ought to make up their minds to begin a policy of repression and persecution. The teaching of the article was disavowed by the moderate Liberal press, and M. de Laveleye wrote to the "Journal de Gand" declaring that he did not share the views of his *collaborateur*, but that he had published the article, because it represented an important phase of the anti-Clerical movement, a policy which had many supporters throughout Europe, and to which still more would rally, "according as the extravagant pretensions of the clergy called forth a more ardent opposition." This is enough to show the spirit of the man. He thoroughly hates the Catholic Church, and in one form or another his hatred for it finds frequent expression. Withal he affects to speak with scientific and judicial impartiality, and it

was thus he assumed to treat his subject, when he wrote and published in his review an extremely prejudiced and one-sided article on Protestantism and Catholicism in their relation to popular liberty and national prosperity. It was immediately republished as a pamphlet at Paris, and translated into Dutch, German, and English by M. de Laveleye's admirers in Amsterdam, Berlin, and London, the English edition having for a preface a letter to the author written by Mr. Gladstone, from which it appears that the pamphlet has been translated into English at the special desire of the member for Greenwich, although he does not in all points concur with the views expressed in it. The original article called forth an able reply from a Belgian Catholic journalist, the Baron de Haulleville, a reply the best eulogy of which is expressed in the opinion Cardinal Deschamps, that "it deserves to be read even after the great works of Balmez" on the same subject. M. de Laveleye's theory has its supporters in England, and is to be met with from time to time in the press, on the platform, and even in conversation. We may therefore profitably consider what answer can be made to it from the Catholic point of view. In framing this reply, we shall develop in its main outlines M. de Haulleville's argument, adding, however, a few facts and considerations from other sources, and occasionally availing ourselves of more recent statistics than those which appear in his pamphlet.

M. de Laveleye's theory is briefly that which was lately set forth by an Italian journalist in the laconic phrase, "The peoples of the Papal religion are either dead or dying."* This Belgian Liberal holds that the future of Europe will be in the hands of Protestant Germans and schismatic Slavs. The Latin race is doomed, and this because it is Catholic. This is the summary of his teaching; let us endeavour to find out upon what grounds he would have us accept it.

First, he tells us that "when in one and the same country, and one and the same group, identical in language, and identical in origin, it can be affirmed that Protestants advance more rapidly and steadily than Catholics, it is difficult not to attribute the superiority of the one over the other to the religions they profess" (p. 11). He cites Ireland and Scotland as cases in point. We shall examine the truth of his conclusions presently. Meanwhile we proceed to select further propositions from his pamphlet.

Secondly, he tells us that "wherever the two religions exist

* "I popoli di religione papale o sono già morti o vanno morire."—*Il Diritto*, the organ of the Depretis-Melegari cabinet.

together in the same country, the Protestants are more active, more industrious, more economical, and consequently richer than the Catholics" (p. 14).

Thirdly, that "throughout Germany at the present day the trade in intellectual works—such as books, reviews, maps, newspapers,—is almost entirely in the hands of Jews and Protestants, to the exclusion of the Catholics" (p. 16).

Fourthly, that "the nations subject to Rome seem stricken with barrenness; they no longer colonize, they have no power of expansion. . . . Their past is brilliant, but their present is gloomy, and their future disquieting" (p. 18).

Fifthly, that "the Catholic countries on both sides of the Atlantic are a prey to internal struggles which consume their strength, or at least prevent them from advancing as steadily and rapidly as Protestant nations" (p. 21).

Sixthly, he attributes to defective popular education a portion of this alleged inferiority.

Lastly, he makes a statement the boldness of which, we venture to say, exceeds that of anything else in his pamphlet, a work which certainly does not err in the matter of over-caution. "It is agreed on all sides," he says, "that the power of nations depends on their morality. . . . Now, it appears to be an established fact that the moral level is higher among Protestants than among Catholic populations" (p. 25).

These seven propositions, we believe, fairly represent M. de Laveleye's position on the question. We shall now proceed to examine them by the light of facts and figures. But before doing so we must make a few observations on the subject as a whole. In the first place, then, we might refuse at the outset to accept the issue which M. de Laveleye has raised, for it is in the main a radically false one. He deals, for the most part, with the comparative prosperity of Catholics and Protestants in mere material things, in wealth, comfort, "progress." He gives his verdict against Catholicity on all these points, and expresses a regret that his own country, and all the other Latin people, did not become Protestants long ago, when the chance was offered them, and so take their due share in the good things of this world. Now, Catholicity never yet claimed to be a wealth-producing agency; it is a religion which counts voluntary poverty among its counsels, doubtless, a very absurd and mischievous proceeding in the eyes of our Belgian professor of political economy. But there stands the fact; the Church does not profess to make of Catholic nations conquering peoples, wealthy peoples, colonizing peoples, or even educated peoples in the ordinary

sense of the word. She does, indeed, tell them to be conquerors, but they are to conquer themselves under her guidance; they are to be rich, but their commerce is to be of that kind which lays up treasures not on earth, but in Heaven; the only enterprises of colonization which the Church demands from them will be the sending forth of missionaries to win new lands to the empire of the Cross; and the highest learning, the best education, and the only one which she regards as *necessary*, will be the knowledge of the way of eternal life. In a word, the Church looks to the after-life for the final result of her labours here. M. de Laveleye would have us sum up the account here, and see which way the balance lies. We tell him plainly he must wait for the hereafter if he is to give any really sound judgment upon the results of Catholicism. A "religion of prosperity" is, of course, quite conceivable. Its precepts would be of a very different character from those of the Church. If any nation could possibly adopt it and follow it, it would perhaps make it more prosperous, in a worldly sense, than any Catholic nation has ever been; but he would be a poor reasoner who would condemn Catholicity for failing in a comparison with the worship of the gods of wealth and ease made by one of the worshippers.

We do not, for a moment, mean to deny that indirectly the religion of a people *may* affect its material prosperity. A religious people who, as a body, are chaste, sober, honest, orderly, and to a greater or less extent industrious, will *probably*, in the long run, find themselves in a better position than an irreligious people, placed in fairly similar circumstances. But unless the conditions are precisely similar in every respect we cannot say more than this, we cannot say *certainly*, instead of *probably*. And the conditions are never more than approximately alike, and the approximation is generally a very rough one. Hence the difficulty of finding a practical test for our theory. We have said, too, that they will probably find themselves "in a better position" materially; we cannot say more than this; we cannot be more definite; we cannot say they will be a wealthy people, a race of conquerors, merchants, or colonists; we only know that they will, if the conditions are alike, be healthier, less liable to sudden vicissitudes of fortune, less troubled by vice and pauperism, the two scourges of modern communities.

If, therefore, we add to the material factors of prosperity those belonging to the moral order, we should expect to see a higher standard reached by Catholic than the non-Catholic nations. The fault, the radical error of M. de Laveleye's estimate of the relative position of Catholic and non-Catholic

lands is, that too often he judges by a purely material criterion. That a nation is successful in war or in commerce by no means proves the superiority of the religion it professes. In commerce the scattered nation of the Jews have certainly surpassed the Christians, but no Jew would ever think of alleging this as an argument against the Gentiles. The nation which has made the most rapid, the most astounding "progress" in our own days, if we use the word progress as M. de Laveleye would use it, is Japan; yet this hardly tends to prove even the material advantages of the modified form of Buddhism which is professed at Yeddo and Yokohama. Nor would any sensible man urge the rapid conquest of the Mahometans, their progress in science and learning, and the culture of the old courts of Bagdad and Granada, as proofs of the superiority of Islamism over the religion of Europe in the ninth century. The argument derived from purely material prosperity is an essentially fallacious one in the mouth of all except materialists. They may consistently urge it, and make the most of it. But we believe M. de Laveleye professes to be a Christian, as certainly does Mr. Gladstone, who has introduced the work to the English public. We are therefore not a little surprised at the method of proof which it attempts, the theory it brings forward. If M. de Laveleye would throughout argue that Protestantism makes men better and holier than Catholicity, he would be consistent; but he insists far more strongly that it makes them wealthier, freer, and more powerful, or at least, that, whatever may be the reason, Protestants enjoy all these advantages in a higher degree than Catholics, and that it is hard to resist the conclusion that the reason of it lies in their Protestantism. But wealth, political freedom, and military power are hardly religious questions, and we repeat, M. de Laveleye cannot, from his point of view, make a fair comparison. He is closing the account and striking the balance before the proper time. True national prosperity consists in a nation's living so that it may have many representatives in Heaven hereafter, and no one can prove to us that Catholicity is not better calculated than Protestantism to produce this result.

There is, however, another difficulty in making a fair comparison. We may speak of a country as being Catholic which contains a large non-Catholic, or even anti-Catholic, element; and how are we to know to what extent this factor in the problem tends to lower the standard of prosperity on the one hand, or morality on the other? M. de Laveleye cites France and Italy as Catholic countries, and he is right; but only with an important reservation. No one will deny that in France

there is an anti-Catholic party, the literature of which is to a great extent irreligious and immoral; yet the misdeeds of this party, which every Catholic reprobates, are coolly urged by M. de Laveleye to turn the scale against Catholic France in a comparison with Germany or England. Again, in the case of a Protestant nation there is often an important Catholic section of the population left wholly out of account; this is especially the case with regard to Germany. In South Germany there are five millions of Catholics out of a total population of eight millions. Bavaria and Baden are in fact Catholic countries. Yet M. de Laveleye takes no account whatever of the German Catholics, except to depreciate them. He refers incidentally to the German conquest of France as a proof of Protestant superiority; perhaps he has forgotten the story of the war. Prince Bismarck's and Von Moltke's victories were more than once bought with Catholic blood. At Woerth, at Sedan, and on the battle-fields of the Loire, the valour of Bavarian Catholics went far to turn the tide of success against France. M. de Laveleye's argument is really a very loosely-constructed one, and prejudice plays a large part in it, making him forget at the same time that Germany owes much to her Catholic subjects, and that in much that he lays to the charge of France, Catholic France has had no part. He makes a great pretence of impartiality—a pretence which has deceived many of his readers, as, perhaps, it deceived himself. "Sectarian passions," he says, "or anti-religious prejudice, have been too often imported into the study of these questions. It is time that we should apply to it the method of observation, and the scientific impartiality of the physiologist and the naturalist. When the facts are once established, irrefragable conclusions will follow." He does not, however, fulfil his promise; he treats his subject in a most unscientific, a most illogical, manner, and therefore arrives at conclusions which are simply worthless. This is evident from the outset.

In proof of his first point, that "in one and the same country, and in one and the same group, identical in language and identical in origin, Protestants advance more rapidly and steadily than Catholics," he compares the Scotch and the Irish. Early in the Middle Ages, he tells us, Ireland was "a focus of civilization, while Scotland was a den of barbarians"; but, he says, since the Reformation Scotland has surpassed even England itself, and while Ireland is poor and miserable, Scotland is peaceful and prosperous; and, more than this, in the very same country, Protestant Ulster is wealthy, while Catholic Connaught is wretchedly poor. The comparison is not a new one, it has been often made; but it is a most unfair one.

In the first place, the Scotch are not "of the same language and of the same origin" as the Irish. This is true only of a small portion of the Scottish race,—the Highlanders and the Islesmen; and we doubt if the Highlands can be called "prosperous," for their "progress" has consisted chiefly in the substitution of sheep and black cattle, grouse and deer, for men.* Again, the races differ equally in Ulster and Connaught. In Connaught we have descendants of an early Celtic race, in Ulster a colony of English and Lowland Scotch. But the question of race is a minor one, and we only allude to it here in order to show how hollow is M. de Laveleye's parade of scientific method. The comparison he has made errs in matters of far greater moment. The causes of the prosperity of Scotland, and the want of prosperity in Ireland, are to be sought in the history of the two countries. Scotland has been eminently fortunate. She was united with England on equal terms; she preserved her own laws, her own courts, her own local institutions. Her manufacturers competed on equal terms with the English trader; the capital of the richer country was placed freely at her disposal; under her own free laws her educational system was steadily developed; finally, there were no wholesale confiscations of land; there was no alien colony, no laws passed in the interest of a minority; no State Church established in the interest of the few. On the other hand, all the miseries that Scotland escaped were inflicted on Ireland; of all the advantages that Scotland possessed, Ireland was deliberately and systematically deprived. The English rule was firmly established in Ireland by the wars of the Tudors, and from the outset she was governed in the interest of the English colony. Repeated confiscations ruined the native proprietors, and placed the land of the country in the hands of men who were really foreigners, who spoke not a word of the Irish language, who professed a strange religion, who, in a word, were an armed garrison holding Ireland in their own interest. The faith of the Irish was proscribed, and those who held that faith were systematically plundered and persecuted. More than once they took up arms against the intolerable tyranny, only to be defeated and placed more completely in the power of their Protestant rulers. Their schools were destroyed, the laws were directed as much against the Catholic schoolmaster as the Catholic priest. Their trade was destroyed

* Sutherlandshire may be cited as an example of rapid progress; but the Duke of Sutherland is descended from a wealthy English family, whose capital has been employed in reclaiming the waste lands of this northern shire, with the help of steam and machinery. The progress of Scotland in this instance is really the result of English enterprise.

by laws for the protection of English commerce and English manufactures.* An Irishman and a Catholic could not have his children educated in his own country; could only practise his religion by stealth; could not aspire to any civil or military dignity; could not even have a horse worth more than five pounds in his possession. It is only in our own day that this iniquitous system has been entirely broken up.† The downfall of the Irish Church Establishment is an event not ten years old. Catholic emancipation is a work of less than fifty years ago. If then Ireland, as compared with Scotland, is so "poor and wretched," the fault must be laid at the doors of Protestant tyranny and intolerance. It is not the fault of Catholicism, unless perhaps in one sense. Had the people abandoned their religion, they might have freed themselves from all their disabilities; but they preferred their faith to earthly goods and earthly prosperity, and they chose to suffer as Catholics, rather than share the good things of this world with their all-powerful Protestant rulers. This, too, explains the difference between Ulster and Connaught; but in that case we must also remember that Connaught is naturally a wilderness of bog and mountain, when compared to Ulster. Place the most industrious race on earth in Connaught and a far inferior people in Ulster, and the Ulster men would in the course of a few years be wealthier and more prosperous in every respect. The comparison between Ulster and Connaught is most misleading, so far as the question of wealth is concerned. We shall, however, have to compare them in another and more important respect later on, and we shall find that then the advantage is with poor Catholic Connaught. A few years ago M. Roussel, a French Protestant *pasteur*, travelled in Ireland and published a pamphlet in which he adopted the same fallacious line of argument as that of M. de Laveleye. The work was severely criticised by a clever writer, who is neither a Catholic nor a friend to Catholicism, M. John Lemoine, of the "*Débats*." We must quote at second-hand from M. de Haulleville some of his remarks:—

"When M. Roussel travelled in Ireland," asks M. John

* The wool trade is a case in point. Even such a work as Mr. Froude's "*English in Ireland*" gives evidence enough incidentally to convince any one that the worst forms of protection were used to destroy Irish, to the advantage of English trade.

† "The Irish Catholics," says Bishop Spalding, "are taunted with their misery when, for two centuries they lived under a code which placed them outside the pale of humanity, of which Lord Brougham said that it was so ingeniously contrived that an Irish Catholic could not lift up his hand without breaking it, and which Edmund Burke denounced as the most proper machine ever invented by the wit of man to disgrace a realm and degrade a people."—*Essays*, Reply to M. de Laveleye, p. 100.

Lemoinne, "did he never feel any remorse of conscience? Did he never ask himself whether the Protestants had not something to do with the misery of this Catholic land? If the Protestants only form one tenth part of the population of Ireland, by what right have they laid violent hands on all the property and revenues of the Catholic Church? And when M. Roussel, in order to prove that the Catholics are no longer oppressed in Ireland, tells us that they have four archbishops, twenty-three bishops, 2,500 churches, and more than 2,000 priests, how is it that he expresses no admiration for this race of poor men, who, despite their misery, find the means to support their Church, while the Protestant bishops, and the Protestant ministers, in virtue of an act of confiscation, live on the fat of the land? How is it that a minister of the Gospel does not recall these simple words:—'Amen I say to you, this poor widow hath cast in more than all they who have cast into the treasury. For all they did cast in of their abundance; but she of her want cast in all she had, even her whole living'?"

Unfortunately, M. de Laveleye writes in the spirit of M. Roussel rather than that of M. John Lemoinne. He forgets that the Irish have had to struggle for bare existence. If he is not ignorant of their history, he has wilfully disregarded it. We believe the next fifty years will clearly show that Catholic Ireland is able to hold its own, even in the field of purely material prosperity. Irishmen in other lands have shown that they are wanting neither in industry nor in enterprise. The late Mr. Maguire's well-known work on the Irish race in America certainly tends to show that their Catholicity is no barrier to the success of Irishmen, if they only are allowed a fair field for their exertions.

But M. de Laveleye does not rely only upon this comparison of Ireland and Scotland. He has other evidence. He quotes from Mr. Hepworth Dixon's book on Switzerland to show that in one and the same canton the Catholics and the Protestants present a contrast to the advantage of the latter. The canton of Appenzell is divided into the two districts of Inner Rhoden, inhabited by 11,900 Catholics, and Ausser Rhoden, which has a population of 46,726 Protestants. Mr. Hepworth Dixon describes the Protestants as industrious and rich; the Catholics as lazy, poor, ignorant, living in scattered huts, and meeting only at mass or at their popular sports. He adds, with a sneer, that instead of books and newspapers they read the lives of the saints. For our part we are very glad to hear it, much more pleased indeed than if we were told that the good people of Inner Rhoden read the works of

Mr. Hepworth Dixon, or even those of M. de Laveleye. Here, however, the comparison is again a misleading one. From information obtained on the spot, M. de Haulleville tells us that the towns and villages of Ausser Rhoden stand in a fertile low-lying district, and that, in point of wealth, their Protestant inhabitants are naturally in a better position than the Catholics of the mountain district of Inner Rhoden, who are a scattered race of shepherds. The charge of ignorance is an idle one. Mr. Dixon himself admits that every one of these Catholic mountaineers can read and write, and the charge really is based upon their strange habit of persisting in reading the lives of the saints in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

But this is not all, M. de Laveleye has yet another argument. He speaks of Nimes as a kind of Protestant oasis of prosperity in the South of France, and he quotes a certain M. Audiganne to show that while the capitalists of Nimes are Protestants, the workmen are Catholics. To our minds, this is as good an argument for us as for him. Whence came the wealth of these Protestants in the first instance we cannot say; but this is certain, for its preservation and its increase they have, as he himself tells us, to depend upon the industry, the steadiness, and the skill of Catholics. Of the two factors of the prosperity of Nimes, one is Protestant, the other Catholic. How this in any way supports M. de Laveleye's theory we fail to see.

While dealing with France, he refers, of course, to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes as having deprived France of a host of skilled workmen, and established abroad injurious centres of competition against her manufactures. There is a regular tradition about this event; but two facts are nearly always overlooked in discussing it. First, the exiles did not introduce the silk manufacture into London: there is documentary evidence that there were silk-weavers, and French silk-weavers too, in Spitalfields, years before the edict was revoked. The same is true of the silk manufacture of the Low Countries. Again, hundreds, perhaps, thousands of the exiles and emigrants were not industrious workmen at all, or, if they were, they did no work after they left France. There were amongst them a considerable number of officers and soldiers; and in the armies of Prussia and of the House of Orange whole companies and regiments of French Huguenots fought against France, under Huguenot officers. We shall not discuss the wisdom or the folly of the revocation. One thing is certain, it has but little bearing on an economic question like the one before us, for the manufactures and the trade of France

suffered no great loss in consequence of it. We return to M. de Laveleye's contention, that Catholics are at the present day, on the whole, less prosperous than Protestants.

It is a fact that in Canada and in the United States the Catholics are as active, as industrious, and as successful as their Protestant fellow-citizens, though our author seems to doubt it. Of the prosperity of the Catholics in the United States we have practical proofs in the institutions and the churches they have founded and endowed; in their press and their literature, and in their munificent offerings to the Holy See. In Lower Canada, three-fourths of the landed property is in Catholic hands; in Upper Canada there are thousands of successful emigrants from Catholic Ireland. The fact is, that M. de Laveleye's second point, the assertion that when the two religions exist in one country the Protestants are more prosperous than the Catholics, cannot be proved to be true as a general rule, and there are many facts which directly contradict it. In Prussia the Catholic provinces are the richest portions of the State. Westphalia, Silesia, and the Rhine Province enjoy a considerable amount of prosperity, while the Protestant provinces of Pomerania, Prussia, and Brandenburg are the poorest, and furnish the largest contingent to the tide of emigration. If M. de Haulleville is correctly informed, the Catholic people of the district of Ermland are in a better position in the matter of wealth and comfort than those of all the rest of their province, which is the Lutheran province of Prussia proper. There are poor Catholic districts indeed in Silesia and Pomerania; but we have not far to seek for the causes of their poverty,—a bad administration, and the suppression of the monasteries and the secularization of their property, during the present century, is, perhaps, sufficient to explain it. But even if it does not, the exception proves nothing. We have only to show either that M. de Laveleye's premises are false, or his reasoning fallacious, in order to destroy his argument. But we believe we have succeeded in doing not one but both of these things, and his theory therefore falls to the ground. Let us proceed, however, to examine the other points which we have enumerated.

The assertion that in Germany the press and the book-trade are entirely in non-Catholic hands is in form a matter of detail; but it is really put forward to make the reader infer that the intellectual position of the Catholics of Germany is a low one. Like many other of M. de Laveleye's assertions, it is wholly incorrect. It is based upon a false view of the state of affairs. The book-trade of Germany is, in the main, concentrated at Leipzig. Even Berlin, M. de Haulleville tells

us, has contended in vain against the virtual monopoly created by the "Leipzig book-fair." Now, if M. de Laveleye looks only to Leipzig, he is right in asserting that the trade is in the hands of Jews and Protestants, for Catholic books are banished from it; but Catholic publishing houses have sprung up in other parts of Germany. The Catholic literature of the country is both valuable, from the learning of its authors, and most extensive in its range of subjects. Of this M. de Laveleye must be as well aware as we are. The catalogues of any great library would tell him as much. The "*Katholik*" of Mayence holds a high rank amongst the periodicals of Germany; and in the press we may notice two ably-written, well-informed, and thoroughly independent papers, the "*Koelnische Volkszeitung*"* of Cologne and the well-known "*Germania*" of Berlin. In all, there are no less than 300 Catholic newspapers in Germany, and this large press maintains its position notwithstanding continual persecution under the press laws† on the one hand, and, on the other, the competition of the Liberal press, assisted as it is by Government information and subventions from the "reptile fund." The Catholics of Germany need fear no comparison with the Protestants in the field of literature and intellectual power.

Name me, if you can (says M. de Haulleville), a great German writer since the death of Goerres, Schlegel, Eichendorf, and the Austrian Grillparzer,‡ who were all Catholics, and of Heinrich Heine, who was a Jew. Who are the orators of the Berlin Parliament? Herr Lasker, a Jew, and Prince Bismarck, a sceptic, who blurts out his words and talks as if he were firing revolver shots. As for the Catholic Centre, it contains a whole group of orators and debaters,—Herr Windthorst, "the pearl of Meppen"; Peter and Augustus Reichensperger; the Baron von Schorlemer-Alost, the "captain" of the Westphalian peasantry; Canon Moufang; and Doctor Joerg.

The very existence of this party of the Centre, organized by Mallinckrodt and Windthorst since 1870, is a proof of the intellectual vigour of the German Catholics. But the charge of tending to thwart and stifle the intellectual development of her children is a strange one to bring against the Catholic

* A paper more than once confounded with the well-known Liberal "*Koelnische Zeitung*," to the mystification of the readers of the Reuter's and Havas telegrams.

† The "*Germania*" has had the honour of having five of its staff imprisoned under the press laws in the course of three years (1873-1875).

‡ We would add to this brief list the Jesuit Joseph Kleutgen, the exponent and defender of the scholastic philosophy, who is also dead within the last three years.

Church. On this point M. de Laveleye's prejudices have quite mastered his reason. All pretence of "scientific method" disappears. He begs the whole question without taking the least trouble to conceal the fallacy.

The apathy (he says) with which two new dogmas have recently been received, which formerly would have roused the strongest opposition and have led to a schism, is a sign of the incredible enfeeblement of all intellectual life in the bosom of the Church (p. 52).

This is really too good. We have here, in the first place, a naïve confession of the utter failure of the much-vaunted *Alt-Katholik* movement. For "apathy" a Catholic will read "unity." M. de Laveleye must know perfectly well that the man who refuses a duly defined dogma of the Faith ceases to be a Catholic. His statement of the case, therefore, resolves itself into an assertion, that because Catholics act as Catholics, and remain Catholics, they must be men of feeble intellect. This, however, requires to be proved. M. de Laveleye assumes it. He knows he is not writing for very critical readers. That is the secret of his bold assertions.

The fourth proposition that we have extracted from M. de Laveleye's pamphlet is to the effect that—

The nations subject to Rome seem stricken with barrenness; they no longer colonize, they have no power of expansion. . . . Their past is brilliant, but their present is gloomy and their future disquieting.

It is not difficult to answer this. England, a Protestant power, is certainly the great colonizer of our day. But she does not stand alone. France has an eminently successful colony in Algeria, another in Cochin China. The conquest and colonization of Algiers was conceived by French statesmen during the reign of Charles X.; it was under the white flag that the French army and navy attacked and conquered Algiers, and destroyed the last home of piracy in the Mediterranean. But more than this, even the colonial empire of England owes much to Catholic enterprise. In the present day how many of her colonists in Canada, at the Cape, in Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, are Catholic Irishmen; and in the past many of her most successful colonies were founded by Catholic France, and fell into the hands of England only by the chance of war. This is notably the case with regard to Canada. That splendid colony was won for England by the valour of Wolfe after it had been founded by the enterprise and the piety of Champlain. Canada is to this day a Catholic country. All its traditions are Catholic. Its founders avowedly wished to create a Catholic state, a

centre from which the light of the Gospel might be carried into the woods of the Great West. The story of the deeds of Champlain and his companions is only too little known in England. It is a bright page in the story of Catholic colonization. Many of the most famous cities of Canada were once humble mission stations. In the autumn of 1641 a priest and a few nuns, with some workmen—in all thirty persons, landed on an island in the St. Lawrence, and erected a few huts and tents, a church built of wood felled on the spot, a little hospital, and a school for the Indian children. This was the mission station of the Hochelaga; it is now the city of Montreal.* This Catholic colony is now a flourishing portion of the colonial empire of England; but it is only fair to remember what was its origin. The Catholic missionaries have been in the past the pioneers of Catholic colonization in other places besides Canada. The first white man who ever looked upon the waters of the Mississippi was a French Jesuit, the Père Marquette. A few years after France founded the colony of Louisiana, which was transferred by treaty to the American Union in the first years of this century. The colonies of Spain in the Philippines belong to the same class. Here, too, the missionary came with the trader. Sir John Bowring has spoken of the Jesuits of the Philippines as the pioneers and the founders of civilization in the great Eastern archipelago. India is the chief gem of the Imperial crown of England, but there were days when only the chance of war decided who should hold it, Protestant England or Catholic France. Dupleix was the first European who, in modern times, conceived the bold plan of founding an Indian Empire, and he only failed in winning it for France because he was opposed by the military skill and the wondrous good fortune of Clive.†

The charge of barrenness in the matter of colonies, therefore, counts for nothing. The colonial empire of England owes much to Catholics, and France is at once a Catholic nation

* We cannot mention Canada without alluding to an enterprise of Catholic colonization belonging to the last few years. In 1871 a party of Catholic Zouaves, who had just retired from Rome, obtained some lands in the heart of the forests of Canada, cleared the ground, built a village, which is now rapidly becoming a town, and brought the adjacent land under cultivation. The little Catholic colony, now less than six years old, has prospered beyond all expectation. It bears the name of Piopolis, in honour of Pius IX.

† The capture of Arcot was the real beginning of England's career of conquest in India. Clive owed his success entirely to the chance that he was able to attack in the midst of a thunderstorm, when the superstition of the Hindus deprived them of all power of resistance.

and a colonizing power.* But M. de Laveleye adds, that though the past of the Catholic nations is brilliant, their present is gloomy, their future disquieting. On this point he expresses an opinion, rather than states any demonstrable fact. We differ from him in opinion, but the matter is so much one of feeling, of political insight and forecast, that we freely grant that it would be as difficult for us to demonstrate the truth of our judgment as it would be for him to prove its contrary. We may, however, bring forward certain considerations in support of it. At present Germany is the strongest power in Europe; England, probably, stands next. Both of these are Protestant nations, though much of their power they owe to Catholics. When Prussia began her career of victory in 1864, more than a third of her people were Catholics. At this moment one-third of the subjects of the German Empire are "subject to Rome," to use our author's favourite phrase. As for England, the Duke of Wellington declared in the House of Lords, that one-half of the men whom he led to victory in the Peninsula were Catholics; and we have it on the authority of Sir Henry Havelock that the pith, the central strength of the army that saved our Indian Empire in 1857 was composed of Catholic Irishmen, who, a few years before, had enlisted during the time of terrible suffering that followed the great famine. At present Austria and France, the two great Catholic nations, are suffering from the effects of defeat; but who knows how the scale will turn in another ten years? And, after all, Catholicism or Protestantism has but little to do with military success. Irish, French, and Austrian soldiers—yes, and Spaniards too—have proved again and again that in any good cause the Catholic fears not to peril life and limb. The glorious records of Castelfidardo, Monte Libretti, and Mentana, more than prove this, if, indeed, any proof were needed. Catholicity has never made men cowards; it has often made them

* We must reply in a note to a note of M. de Laveleye's. The only fact he gives in support of his statement that Catholic nations no longer colonize, is contained in a note, which states that in 1867 the Comte de Beauvoir, on visiting the island of Sha Myen in the Canton river, ceded in 1861 to France and England, found in the English half of the island a village built in six years; a Protestant church, handsome houses, a cricket-ground, and a race-course; while the French half contained only uncultivated trees, rubbish, moles, and stray dogs and cats (which last, we presume, came from the English village). This, he supposes, proves a "want of expansive power" in the Catholic nation. It only proves that the French merchants in China, actuated by commercial ideas only, have, wisely or unwisely, as the case may be, neglected to colonize Sha Myen. If M. de Laveleye should ever visit China, he will find a flourishing colony at Saigon, and French merchants and consuls in all the great ports.

heroes. Had the Republicans of Paris fought but half as well as the "mercenaries" of Pius IX. did upon the field of Loigny, the Prussian dragoons would never have marched through the Arc de Triomphe.

We believe in the future of the Catholic nations. At this very moment Austria is rapidly becoming again an important factor in the politics of Central Europe. If Austria and France, with their governments, were thoroughly Catholic, we should have but little fear for them. The non-Catholic element in France is the greatest obstacle to her prosperity. We believe, too, in the future of Spain. She is recovering from the loss of her colonial empire; she enjoys peace; statistics prove that her wealth and her population are increasing; her resources are being rapidly developed; she is still a naval power of some weight, and she possesses a splendid army. If her statesmen would but abandon Cuba to its fate, she would be relieved at once of a fearful tax of blood and treasure. Our forecast may not be a correct one, but numbers of unprejudiced men share our opinion. Only the experience of the next few years can verify or discredit it. But, however this may be, the future of the Protestant empire of Germany and the future of M. de Laveleye's other favourite, the empire of the Czar, are not wholly unclouded. Socialism in Germany, Nihilism in Russia, are sources of danger that are not to be contemned. The throne of the Emperor William is not, after all, as secure as that of his Imperial brother of Catholic Austria; and if any one thing is being clearly brought to light in the field of European politics, it is the fact that the "great Slav power" ruled by the Czar is rotten to the core.

But M. de Laveleye points to another aspect of the politics of the Catholic nations. "The Catholic countries," he says, "on both sides of the Atlantic are a prey to internal struggles." Very true, at least in many cases; but why should Catholicity bear the blame of this? On M. de Laveleye's friends, the Liberals, must, we fear, be laid by far the greater part of the blame due to the fomenters of the troubles, the "internal struggles," the revolutions of France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Mexico, and many of the South American States. The history of the last ninety years proves this. But is it Catholic nations only on both sides of the Atlantic that have been torn by internal struggles of late years? The United States have been spoken of as held by a Protestant nation. What of the great conflict that raged for four years from the Gulf of Mexico to the valley of the Ohio? And in Europe, was there not bloodshed in the streets of Berlin in 1848? Did not German armies meet in civil conflict as lately as 1866? The

armies that marched side by side into France in 1870 had fired upon each other only four years before. M. de Laveleye has a wondrous faculty of forgetting. He forgets what Liberalism has done to trouble the peace of Catholic nations ; he forgets that Protestant nations have had their periods of difficulty and trial. By taking such an imperfect view of the position of affairs, it is easy to "prove" anything.

Throughout M. de Laveleye refers again and again to England as the pattern of a free and peaceful nation. He attributes this to English institutions, and gives to Protestantism the credit of their success. Here again he has forgotten the teaching of history. The foundation of the institutions of England was laid in Catholic times, and by Catholic hands. No nation in Europe has in its constitution and laws preserved so much that belongs to its old Catholic legislation. Elsewhere the continuity has been broken by the absolutism of the post-Reformation period, when the popular liberties of the Middle Ages were, in most countries, destroyed, far more than by the revolutions of the last years of the eighteenth century. This is a wide subject, and we cannot enter upon it here. The single fact that the Church is the guardian of a higher law than that of the State makes her the best guardian of civil liberty. The mediæval institutions of Italy, Spain, France, and England itself practically prove this. But it is only in England that they have been preserved and developed to our day. How this has been effected is a question for history. But one fact meets us on the very threshold of the inquiry. Protestantism in England was the work of Tudor despotism, which paved the way for the policy of the Stuarts, and by an unbroken chain of events, led up to the civil war and the English revolution.

M. de Laveleye having endeavoured to show that Catholicity is less favourable to national development than Protestantism, proceeds to indicate what he supposes are the causes of this inferiority which he has alleged, but certainly has not proved. He tells us that in a Catholic country the priests form a separate caste, whose interests are not those of the nation at large, while in a Protestant country the minister is none the less a citizen because he is a pastor. We can only speak of this as a calumny against the Catholic clergy. It is a favourite fiction of European Liberalism, but it imposes upon no one. Patriotism in its best and highest sense is a duty imposed upon every Catholic. Love of country, loyalty, respect for the law—these are things which the Catholic priesthood has ever set before the people as essential characteristics of the citizens of a civilized country. In Elizabeth's days priests were indeed

tortured and executed on false charges of treason. History has reversed the judgment of hostile courts, and it is now clear as noonday that the men who suffered and died at Tyburne for their faith were as loyal Englishmen as they were good Catholics.

M. de Laveleye, however, indicates two other sources of inferiority,—a lower standard of popular education, and a lower standard of morality prevailing among Catholic than among Protestant peoples. Here again,* we have in both instances assertion without proof. He says, indeed, that Catholics regard reading as the shortest road to heresy, that the Church has neglected education, that the educational system of Catholic countries is defective, compared to that of Protestant nations, that "it was the schoolmaster that conquered at Sedan."† Catholics need never fear any candid inquiry into the Church's influence on education. There were schools in Europe before Martin Luther's days. He certainly did not learn his letters from a Protestant schoolmaster. Nine-tenths of the universities of Europe trace back their origin to Catholic times. There was hardly an abbey in the Middle Ages that had not its school. The author of "*Christian Schools and Christian Scholars*" has shown clearly that the primary school is not an invention of the nineteenth century.‡ At the present day the Catholic Belgian province of Luxembourg has a more perfect organization for popular education than any country in Europe, and that too, without compulsion. Only one per cent. of the people are uneducated. In Germany, the Catholic provinces are fully equal to the Protestant districts in this

* Whether reading, writing, and arithmetic make men fight better is very doubtful. Prussia had a system of compulsory education before 1789, yet the "schoolmaster" did not conquer at Jena. This appeal to "the ordeal of combat" is a favourite one with M. de Laveleye, but it proves nothing. We take from M. de Haulleville the following remarks as one of his minor charges against France. "M. de Laveleye asserts," he says, "that during the war of 1870 the French wounded (Catholics) asked for playing-cards, while the Prussian convalescents (Protestants) only asked for books. I heard no one ask for cards in the ambulances during that war, but I know that many of the German wounded, Bavarians, Rhinelanders, Westphalians, and Poles (Catholics), who had been shot down for the German cause, which is represented nowadays as the cause of Protestantism, protested against the Protestant books which were given to them. The service of the hospitals had provided for everything except this" (p. 232).

† Bishop Spalding in his 2nd article on M. de Laveleye's pamphlet, treats briefly, but with sufficient fullness, the history of Catholic popular education from the 9th century. He also states that at present the educational statistics of Europe show that the school attendance compared with the population is in Bavaria as 1 to 7, Austria 1 to 10, Belgium 1 to 10·5, Ireland 1 to 16, Catholic Switzerland 1 to 16, and in England as 1 to 17.

respect. In France, primary education is highly developed, especially in the towns. Its success is largely due to the Catholic teaching orders of men and women. M. Maxime du Camp, a Liberal, like M. de Laveleye, gives the first rank among the primary schools of Paris to those of the Sisters of Charity. Rome, the very centre of clericalism, Papal Rome, with a population of 158,000, had, according to Mr. Laing,* in the year 1843, 372 primary schools, attended by 14,099 children, and conducted by 452 teachers. Berlin, in the same year, with double the population, had only 264 schools. The Papal States had seven universities, with a population of only two and a half millions, while the twenty-six million Protestants of Germany, at the present day, have exactly the same number of universities—seven. So much for the charge that the Catholic Church is opposed to, or careless of, the education of her children. More than half the nuns whom M. de Laveleye's Liberal friends would expel from Belgium if they could, give their whole lives without fee or reward to the teaching of the children of the poor.

But, as M. de Hauleville justly remarks, M. de Laveleye "surpasses himself" in his last proposition. "It is agreed," he says, "that the power of nations depends on their morality. Now, it appears that the moral level is higher among Protestants than among Catholics." The arguments brought forward in support of this daring assertion are the weakest in the book. M. de Laveleye points triumphantly to the immoral literature of France and the French drama. If this literature were the work of Catholics, it would be a fair argument, but all the world knows that is produced by men and women of his own school of political and philosophical thought. Madame Georges Sand and M. Paul de Kock were neither of them Catholics. The Church condemns this pernicious literature, and does all that she can to oppose it and limit its evil effects. But its circulation is not confined to France. Any London bookseller can give us evidence that the French novel, in the form to which M. de Laveleye alludes, enjoys a wide popularity in Protestant England. Nor is Protestant Germany without reproach. The country where "The Sorrows of Werther" is still a favourite story, has little to boast of in this respect; and as for America, there are journals of high standing, even in New York, which simply trade upon public vice in a way that even a Parisian journal would not venture to attempt. The charge of fostering immorality is a strange

* "Notes of a Traveller." London: 1842-48.

one to bring against the Catholic Church. We do not say that a man is established in virtue by the mere fact of being a Catholic. But we do insist that the Catholic Church protects the virtue of her children by the most rigid precepts, and places before them the highest standard in the matter of morality and purity. It is the glory of the Catholic Church to have protected by the highest sanctions the indissoluble bond of marriage; it is the reproach of the Reformation that it has reintroduced divorce into Europe. There is no Catholic who does not know that many things are grievous sins which only too many of those outside the pale of the Church look upon as pardonable follies. Then, as the guarantee and the perpetual vindicator of this exalted standard of morality, there is the sacrament of Penance which daily is the means of saving hundreds from the toils of sin. It is only natural to expect that all this would have the effect of placing the Catholic nations very high in the scale of comparative morality, and we shall show that this is the case. Paris is not a Catholic city, the cup of her iniquities is filled up from the whole world; the vice of Paris is made a reproach to Catholic France which condemns and repudiates it; but it would not be difficult to show that Protestant Berlin has nothing to boast of in comparison with Paris, and Protestant London very little. The most immoral country in Europe is Sweden, the citadel of Lutheranism, where conversion to Catholicity is still forbidden by penal laws. Mr. Bayard Taylor's account of Stockholm places that city at once lowest in the rank of European capitals.

But this is a matter which can be tested very fairly by statistics. We shall pass over it very briefly, and only give a few of the figures at our command. We will restrict our survey entirely to our own islands, and take the data supplied by the Registrar-General's returns of the proportions between legitimate and illegitimate births. In England, in 1873, the proportion was 5·6 illegitimate in every 100 registered births; in Scotland, the most Protestant of the three kingdoms, it was 9 per cent.; in Catholic Ireland 2·7 per cent. More than this, when we examine the returns for a series of years, we find that the highest percentage is always registered in Ulster, and that the disproportion between the returns of the North-east of Ireland and those of the rest of the country is remarkable. The purely Catholic districts of the West and South-west, that is to say, Connaught and the greater part of Munster, stand best in the scale. Take the following table of the percentage in all Ireland, and in the North-east, West and South-west from 1867 to 1871.

<i>Divisions.</i>	1867.	1868.	1869.	1870.	1871.
All Ireland.....	3·3	3·1	2·9	2·7	2·7
North-east.....	5·7	5·5	5·3	5·3	5·2
West.....	1·2	1·3	1·3	1·0	1·0
South-west.....	2·0	2·1	1·7	1·7	1·6

M. de Laveleye compared the prosperity of Ulster with the misery of Connaught, and asked us to infer that Catholicity was a misfortune to the West of Ireland. Catholicism or Protestantism may have very little to do with the question of wealth, but certainly they have much bearing upon the question of morality. It matters little to a man hereafter whether he has been poor or rich here, but it is of great import to him to have been virtuous or vicious. In this point then,—and it is the most serious of all, Catholic Connaught stands far higher than Ulster. Ulster has, perhaps, more wealthy families, more comfortable houses; but the cabins of Connaught give shelter to a purer race. We see then, that in the scale of morality, Scotland stands lowest of any country in the United Kingdom, England comes next, Ireland stands highest; and when we take separate districts of Ireland, it is precisely the most Protestant district that stands lowest, the most Catholic districts that stand highest.* It is hard for any one to resist the conclusion that the religion of the people is the cause of this. Assuredly *Digitus Dei hic est*.

* Bishop Spalding has collected the following interesting statistics of illegitimacy in various countries, which confirm the evidence derived from our own Registrar-General's returns.

Per-centage of illegitimate births :—

<i>Catholic Countries.</i>	<i>Protestant Countries.</i>
Sardinia (1828-37)	Norway (1855)
Spain (1859)	Sweden (1855)
Tuscany	Protestant Prussia (1858)
Catholic portion of Prussia	Hanover (1855)
France (1858)	Denmark (1855)
	Iceland (1838-47)
	Saxony (1858)
	Württemberg (1858)

In Catholic France, as in Catholic Ireland, the most Catholic districts stand best in the statistics. Thus, while the rate for all France is 7·8, the rate for the rural districts is 4·2; for La Vendée, 2·2; for Brittany, 1·2. In England the rural districts stand lowest in the scale of morality. The same rule holds good in Germany, the Catholic districts are the purest. The statistics stand :—

<i>Catholic.</i> { Westphalia, 3·5.	<i>Protestant.</i> { Pomerania }	} 10 to 12.
{ Rhineland, 3·3	{ Brandenburg }	

This evidence is irresistible, the rule holds good throughout.

We have seen already how weak is M. de Laveleye's line of argument, how uncertain are his premises, how fallacious is his reasoning. We do not charge him with wilfully deceiving and misleading his readers; but we do charge him with reckless carelessness, thoroughly unscientific method, and utter incompetency for the task he has undertaken. His book is not a "study of social economy." It is a prejudiced attack upon Catholicism, which does not bear a few minutes' serious examination. It has not even the merit of ordinary plausibility. We have shown that in the various points of material wealth and power, ability to colonize, education, and morality, the Catholic nations have nothing to fear from a comparison with Protestant peoples. That in the last particular, and the most important of all, they stand highest in the scale. And on all these points we have adduced only a portion of the evidence at our command. The field of inquiry is such a wide one that a volume would be required for its full treatment.

We must say, in conclusion, that we agree with M. de Haulleville in anticipating a brilliant future for Catholicity, and for the Catholic nations. The Catholic revival in France and Italy; the conquests achieved by Catholicity in England, Germany, and America; the glorious work which is being done by Catholic missionaries alike in the East and the West; the wondrous unity, not only of doctrine but of feeling and sentiment, that pervades the whole Church; the devotion alike of pastors and peoples to Rome,—all are unmistakable auguries for future good. Learning and literature flourish now as they have ever flourished, under the fostering care of the Church, Protestantism is everywhere dead or dying. Already its influence is gone. Men will soon be either infidels or Catholics. The Church has conquered Protestantism as she conquered Arianism; she will conquer infidelity and Liberalism as she conquered Paganism and Roman Cæsarism. She is the true civilizing power of the present, as she was in the past. Even as we write, while Liberal philanthropists are talking of opening up Africa, the sons of the Church are not talking but working, and quietly and unostentatiously preparing the way for a systematic attempt to win the dark land of Central Africa to the cross of Jesus Christ. With all this before our eyes, we cannot share in any gloomy forebodings for the future of Catholic peoples. We are approaching the close of one century, the opening of another. The nineteenth century has been an age of Liberalism, for which the eighteenth had prepared the way. Is there any reason why the twentieth century should not be an age of Catholicity, the ultimate result of the Pontificate of Pius IX.? We do not think there

is. On the contrary, we believe that there is every reason why we should hope and pray for such an event. Even humanly speaking, it is more than possible, and he would be a daring man who would say that the hope is a baseless one.

ART. VII.—SIMON DE MONTFORT, EARL OF
LEICESTER.

Royal and other Historical Letters of the Reign of Henry III. Edited by
WALTER SHIRLEY, D.D. London: Longmans. 1866.

Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester. By WALTER SHIRLEY, D.D.
Quarterly Review, January, 1866.

The Life of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester. By G. W. PROTHERO.
London: Longmans. 1877.

Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester. By REINHOLD PAULI. Translated
by U. M. GOODWIN; with Introduction by HARRIET MARTINEAU.
London: Trübner. 1876.

Life of Simon de Montfort. By M. CREIGHTON, M.A. London: Riving-
tons. 1876.

The Barons' War. By WILLIAM HENRY BLAAUW, M.A. London: Nichols
& Son. 1844.

Chronicle of William de Rishanger of the Barons' Wars. Edited by O.
HALLIWELL, F.R.S. Camden Society. 1840.

THE reputation of few great men has undergone such fluctuations as that of Simon de Montfort. Honoured and loved during life, worshipped as a saint after death, then branded with infamy as a rebel and hypocrite, he is now again raised on the pinnacle of fame as the creator of the English Constitution. These fluctuations have not arisen from the discovery of any documents, which have thrown additional light on his character, but solely from corresponding fluctuations of popular sentiment and principle on religious and political subjects.

All the books at the head of this article, being taken more or less directly from the national records and contemporary chronicles, are valuable and interesting, so far as regards the incidents alone of De Montfort's life. But when we pass

beyond the bare incidents, we at once become conscious of a great deficiency, for we fail to catch a living picture of the hero. Nor is it hard to account for this defect. If, generally speaking, "a man's religion is the chief thing about him,"* much more is it so with De Montfort, the mainspring of whose life was religion. Hence it is evident that writers who do not understand and who habitually misrepresent his religion, must not only fail to depict him correctly, but must often give us a travesty in the place of a true likeness. Thus they tell us that his contemporaries worshipped him as a saint, and yet they describe him as ambitious, proud, imperious, ungoverned in tongue and temper; apparently without a suspicion, that the mere fact of Catholics having considered him a saint, is a conclusive proof that he could not possibly have been haughty, fierce, and undisciplined.

In dealing with public events they fall into similar mistakes through ignoring the central idea of the age, that all Christians, whether as nations or individuals, were members of one family, of which Christ's Vicar was the Father and Judge. To call this common father and judge a "foreign power," betrays gross ignorance of the spirit of the time. To complain of his interference in national affairs, is absurd. Had he not interfered, all Europe would have cried out against him in the words of Queen Eleanor to Pope Celestine:—

As the Vicar of the Crucified, the successor of Peter, the Pontiff of Christ, the Anointed of the Lord, you cannot be silent without guilt and infamy. . . . The Prince of the Apostles reigns in the Apostolic See, and is placed over the nations as a severe judge. It rests with you, who have been established for that purpose over nations and kingdoms, to draw the sword of Peter against the wicked.†

Before we enter on the consideration of De Montfort's life and character, we must notice some important misrepresentations of political events previously to his arrival in England.

Pauli makes the strange assertion, that Henry II.'s opposition to S. Thomas of Canterbury, was based on the old Teutonic institutions and legal customs of the Anglo-Saxons.‡ But it is notorious that the exact contrary was the case, and that S. Thomas held "the constitutional position of the Primate, as champion of the old English customs and law against the personal despotism of the king."§

* Carlyle, "Lectures on Heroes," Lect. I.

† Epp. Pet. Bles., 144, 146, ap. Rohrbacher, "Hist. Eglise," vol. xvi. p. 498.

‡ P. 2.

§ Green, "Short. Hist. Eng.," p. 122.

Again, Pauli and Creighton misrepresent the relation of Pope Innocent III. to John and his barons. They tell us that "Innocent III. required" John to take, "at the hands of Pandulph, . . . the oath of fealty for England and Ireland",* and that he "helped the king against the barons, and received from John, as the price of his help, the surrender of the English crown."† But Innocent had nothing whatsoever to do with John's act of fealty "at the hands of Pandulph," whom he had not even authorized to receive it; and Nicholas, Bishop of Tusculum, had afterwards to be sent from Rome expressly for the purpose.‡ Neither Pope nor Legate "required" this submission from John, but his barons compelled him to it, as they themselves afterwards reminded the Pope.§ Pauli has evidently some idea of this fact; for he says, "There was a moment when the English barons . . . appeared as the Pope's allies. . . . They had once well-nigh desired, but now disowned" the Pope's "paramount authority."|| Notwithstanding, he makes the above contradictory assertion.

Shirley describes the true relations of Rome and the English nation in the following passage:—

Between the Papacy and the National Church no serious differences had then arisen; and the Pope was regarded as the head and mainstay of the most revered and the most popular institution in the country. Indeed, before the struggles of the thirteenth century had given birth to the English Constitution, its functions were indirectly supplied, so far as they were supplied at all, by the action and influence of the Church. Through it plebeian thoughts and plebeian feelings ever found an expression; through it men of the humblest origin rose to high place and power, and mitigated by their presence the harsh principles of feudalism, humanized the courts of law, and gave encouragement to the gentle arts of peace.

But he unhappily adds, and Creighton echoes him:—

It was in the reign of King John that the first great shock had been given to the popular reverence for Rome. It was then first felt that, on questions vital to England, the interests of Rome and of the English Church might be not only different, but absolutely opposed. . . . Langton fell under the Papal ban for expressing English feelings . . . and the wishes of the nation . . . and for maintaining English rights. . . . The minority of Henry III. witnessed, for the first and last time in our history, the attempt of a foreign Power to govern England through a Viceroy, and that viceroy a Legate.¶

* Pauli, p. 5.

† Creighton, p. 63.

‡ Matthew Paris. "*Chronica Majora*," vol. ii. pp. 565-570. Ed. Luard.

§ Mauclerc in "*Rymer, Fœdera*," i. p. 185.

|| Pp. 5, 6.

¶ Shirley, p. 36; Creighton, p. 63.

VOL. XXIX.—NO. LVIII. [*New Series.*]

This expression of the Protestant feeling of the nineteenth century, becomes sheer nonsense when transferred to the thirteenth. In the thirteenth century who ever dreamt that the decision on a question of justice and respective rights, should be influenced by national wishes and interests? Nay, who would not have been scandalized by such a supposition? A distinctive idea of that age of faith was the recognition of a standard of absolute truth and justice, higher than that of political expediency and quite independent of it, of which the Pope was the recognized guardian and expositor. Langton was not excommunicated for expressing any feelings or wishes whatsoever, but for refusing to obey the Pope and excommunicate the barons. It was not he, but the Pope, who defended English rights. The barons of highest repute for patriotism and strength of character, were aware of this. For he had said to them:—

As we would not have the king deprived of his rights, so we would have him desist from harassing you; lest by evil customs and iniquitous exactions England should be oppressed in the Pope's name.*

Accordingly, as Prothero and Pauli tell us, they had a mis-giving "that they might have gone too far"† in "their attempt to establish their own permanent authority side by side with that of the king."‡ They could not "fail to perceive that the charter would have temporarily, perhaps permanently, restrained the free exercise of the royal authority; and it was equally undeniable that the measures adopted in order to bring about this result were revolutionary in character."§

Accordingly, they remained true to John in his last and greatest difficulties.|| They gathered round his infant heir, and in union with the Legate promulgated Magna Charta, freed from the faults which the Pope had condemned. It was they, and "no foreign power," who governed England during Henry's minority; and the Legate, watching over the interests of both king and people, gave to their acts the sanction which they and all their contemporaries regarded as that of Christ Himself.

Shirley complains, that during Henry's minority "we find" Pandulph "writing to the Justiciar and to Des Roches, as the haughtiest of the Plantagenets might have written to

* Rymer, i. p. 205.

† Prothero, chap. i. p. 16.

‡ Pauli, p. 12.

§ Ibid., p. 10.

|| Stubb's "Constit. Hist.," vol. ii. c. xiv. p. 16.

his humblest minister."* But it is evident that at a time when, as he himself tells us, the whole country and all the royal castles were in the hands of a few nobles, and the revenue was almost extinct, when private feuds set town against town and noble against noble, and acts of violence were committed with impunity by high officials, a stronger hand than that of a mere fellow-subject and equal, was needed to control the anarchy.† It was of vital importance to have the support of a spiritual power, that could dare at a critical moment to write to the Justiciar, "Stand firm, do nothing against justice, hope in the author of our salvation; for I fear nought, whatsoever man may say against me."‡

A glance at the correspondence of Pope Honorius III. and Pandulph, suffices to prove how invaluable was their support to the English Regent and Justiciar, whether in compelling the surrender of royal castles, or preserving them in the king's hands;§ in collecting the revenue;|| in negotiating with the kings of France and Scotland, and Llewellyn, Prince of Wales; in protecting the king and his sister against their mother and her husband, the Comte de la Marche;¶ and in defending the king's subjects from Jewish money-lenders,** nobles like Fawkes de Bréauté, Warrenne, and Albemarle,†† and violence and injustice of all kinds.‡‡ At a later period we find Honorius pleading for justice and mercy to Fawkes de Bréauté§§ and his widow,||| exhorting Henry to be "more impartial and forbearing to his subjects,"¶¶ and annulling the "presumptuous and iniquitous" statute, which excluded all the Irish clergy, however respected and learned, from ecclesiastical dignities.***

We now proceed to consider Simon de Montfort's life and character from a Catholic point of view. He was born about the beginning of the thirteenth century. His descent was more than commonly illustrious; and his father was the celebrated crusader against the Albigenses. About 1230 he came to England. In 1232 Henry III. gave him the Earldom of Leicester, the hereditary claim to which, through his grandmother, Amicia, his elder brother, Amauri, resigned to him. But Henry obliged him to renounce all claims to his father's

* "Royal and Historical Letters of the Reign of Henry III.," vol. i. pref. 20.

† Ibid., p. 21.

‡ Ibid., Ep. 68, p. 78, from Pandulph to Hubert de Burgh.

§ Ibid., vol. i. pp. 535, 539.

¶ Ibid., p. 536.

†† Ibid., pp. 105, 111, 129, 130.

‡‡ Ibid., pp. 234, 543, 544.

§§ Ibid., p. 540.

|| Ibid., pp. 28, 36.

** Ibid., p. 35.

†† Ibid., p. 167.

||| P. 547.

*** Ibid., p. 541.

rank and lands in France before he could take his place as an Englishman.

We now get our first personal glimpse of him through a letter from Grosseteste, then prebend, and afterwards bishop of Lincoln. The letter is without date, but the superscription, in which Grosseteste describes himself as "the unworthy minister of the church of Lincoln," proves that it must have been written before 1235, when he became bishop. It is a treatise on the first principles of justice, such as might be addressed to a young man entering on his baronial duties; and it was called for by a report that Simon was about to punish a citizen of Leicester too severely, not that he had "too harshly punished" him, as Pauli tell us.* Grosseteste explains at great length, that it is equally wicked not to punish the guilty as to punish the innocent; that to punish the wicked less than they deserve, is an imitation of Christ, who punishes all less than they deserve; while to punish them beyond their deserts, is tantamount to punishing the innocent, and places the judge on a footing with Herod, who massacred the Holy Innocents, and with the Jews, who crucified the Son of God. He then proceeds to the case in point, and prays God that it may be far from the Earl's intention to throw off his human nature and assume the ferocity of the lion, or rather of devils, and thus to make himself the associate of Herod and those who crucified our Lord. He concludes:—

Let not cruelty rage against the above citizen, nor severity be rigid. But let mercy exceed justice; that you may be an example of clemency and mercy, and not a cruel master. Farewell.†

The king's favour drew on Simon the jealousy of the barons, and in 1237 they complained of him in general terms, as one of "the infamous and mistrusted men who were said to foment" Henry's misdeeds, and who consequently were "exceedingly hateful to the English nobles, although they derived their origin from the same kingdom."‡ An imprudent marriage soon after gave them just cause of displeasure.

Simon's tall, handsome person and knightly accomplishments had already won in succession the hearts of two noble ladies, the Countess of Flanders and the Countess of Boulogne. But the King of France had objected to his marrying either, on account of his connection with England. He now fell in love with Eleanor, Henry's youngest sister, and carried away by his ardent, impetuous nature, he cast aside all thought

* P. 43.

† Grosseteste's "Epistolæ," Ep. 48, p. 141. Ed. Luard.

‡ Matt. Par., p. 446. Ed. Wats.

of the grave obstacles which existed to his marrying her. Eleanor had been married, while still a child, to the younger William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke; and on his death in 1231, when she was sixteen, she had taken a vow of perpetual widowhood, but without receiving the veil,* or entering a cloister. Notwithstanding, she returned Simon's love, and on the 7th of January, 1238, they were privately married in the king's chapel, and the king gave her away.† The marriage could not long be kept secret. When it became known the barons, irritated that the king should have given his sister in marriage without their consent, assembled in arms, headed by the king's brother, Richard, Earl of Cornwall. But after long and angry discussions, Simon, having humbled himself before Richard, obtained his forgiveness, and the king having sworn to reform his conduct, the matter passed off.‡

Simon and Eleanor had still to make their peace with the Church. With this view Simon set out for Rome. The object of his journey was not, as Shirley tells us, to "make good a marriage which was really in itself invalid";§ but to obtain the Pope's authoritative sentence whether a marriage had been contracted or not, and to get Eleanor a dispensation from her vow. We are not told distinctly on what grounds the doubt about the marriage rested, but it seems to have been because opinions in England were divided as to the nature of Eleanor's vow. If it had been a simple vow, its obligation would have been invalidated by the higher obligation of the sacrament of matrimony, and a valid marriage, which even the Pope could not annul, would have been contracted. But if, on the contrary, the vow had been a solemn one, a marriage could not possibly have been contracted. At the present day solemn vows can be taken only by the members of a very limited number of religious Orders. But at that time they were more common, and were sometimes taken even by persons still living in the world. In any case, as the doubt about the marriage had arisen, the Pope's final sentence was indispensable.

On his way to Rome Simon visited the Emperor Frederic II., who gave him a letter to the Pope. At Rome the evidence as to the circumstances of the vow was found to be conflicting. Pope Gregory IX., therefore, wrote to his Legate in England: "The circumstances have been differently related by different persons; wherefore, we see nothing contrary to the presumption that a marriage has been contracted"; and he directed him to absolve Eleanor from her

* Wykes, p. 65. Ed. Luard.

† Ibid., p. 468.

‡ Matt. Par., pp. 465, 471.

§ P. 33.

vow.* Simon now returned to England, and on the 14th of October he was most joyfully received by Henry. Six weeks later his wife bore him a son, to whom the king stood god-father.

On the 16th of the following June, Prince Edward was born; and at his baptism by the Legate four days after, Simon was one of his sponsors and officiated as Hereditary Lord High Steward.†

But on the 9th of August, when he and Eleanor arrived at court to attend the queen to her churching, the king flew out in a rage, and calling him an excommunicated man, drove him and his wife from his presence. Overwhelmed by this unexpected outbreak, they hastened by water to the palace of the late Bishop of Winchester, which the king had lent them. But Henry ordered them to be forcibly ejected thence; and though they returned to him, and with tears earnestly besought his pardon, they could not appease him. In frantic rage he accused Simon of having seduced his sister before marriage, of having got a dispensation at Rome by bribes, and, as a climax of wickedness, of having, without his knowledge, made him a security for the money that he had promised at Rome to pay.

The unhappy couple, overcome with shame, embarked on the Thames in a small boat and hurried away from England. But Henry's mean spite pursued them; for he wrote to his agent in Rome, not to allow English privileges to be pleaded on behalf of the Earl of Leicester in a suit that he was carrying on against the ex-Count of Brittany.‡ Henry's anger seems, however, to have been as evanescent as it had been irrational. For in the following spring, when Simon paid a hurried visit to England, he received him with his usual cordiality, and Simon, with his characteristic generosity, cast the veil of oblivion over his late outrageous conduct.§

All the biographers acquit Simon and Eleanor of the criminal connection of which Henry accused them; and they agree that, as in the parallel case of Hubert de Burgh, the miserably weak king had been worked on by worthless favourites to get rid of virtuous men, who stood in the way of their selfish plans. As to the charge of bribery, Prothero and Creighton believe it; while Shirley rejects the possibility of it, because "the chances of a misunderstanding in such a case were not inconsiderable . . . and a dishonourable transaction

* Autograph. Rom. Pont. Mus. Brit. MS. Add. 15,354, p. 84. Ap. Pauli, p. 36.

† Matt. Par., p. 488.

‡ "Royal Letters," vol. ii. Ep. 426, p. 16. § Matt. Par., p. 527.

of this kind was utterly alien to Simon's character."* The only proof of bribery that Prothero and Creighton allege, is the fact that Simon collected a large sum of money before he went to Rome. But to consider this a proof of bribery, betrays ignorance of Catholic practice, and forgetfulness of the social customs of the age. The long journey to Rome and visits to two sovereign courts, especially at a time when the interchange of presents was, as it still is in the East, an indispensable act of courtesy, would necessarily cause a great outlay. Moreover, in accordance with ordinary Catholic practice, some other obligation would doubtless have been imposed instead of the vow. Simon would probably have been required to join the Crusade, as this was the object most earnestly desired by all the Popes, and especially by Gregory IX.; and he seems to have been allowed to commute this obligation for the gifts and promises of money mentioned by Matthew Paris, which would have been applied to the same purpose. Probably, at the time of Henry's outbreak Simon had been pressing him to pay some of the debts he was always owing to his sister, on the ground that he would be excommunicated unless he fulfilled the promises he had made at Rome. This supposition would explain Henry's mention of excommunication, and making him a security for Simon's payment; and it is also borne out by the fact, that Simon, apparently not being able to raise the money, actually went the following year on crusade.

Another motive which Shirley and Pauli suppose may have actuated Henry, is that Simon being a friend of the Emperor Frederic, who had just been excommunicated by the Pope, and Henry being very devout, the latter may have been worked upon by his favourites to think it necessary to throw off Simon by trumping up this charge against him.† Prothero, however, rejects this supposition, on the ground that there is no reason for supposing that Henry had broken off intercourse with Frederic, or that Simon had lost the favour with which he had recently been regarded at Rome.‡ In fact, Henry always kept up family relations with Frederic; and though he often used the Pope's name for selfish purposes, he never made any sacrifice for him.

Prothero, however, agrees with the other biographers, that Simon may have been influenced through life by the bold ideas and anti-papal policy of Frederic.§ Such a surmise is a striking proof of the inability of prejudiced non-Catholic

* *Ibid.*, p. 31.

† Shirley, p. 31; Pauli, p. 40.

‡ P. 48.

§ Prothero, p. 46; Pauli, p. 47; Shirley, p. 29.

writers to form a correct estimate of the character of Catholics. No two persons could have been more opposite in every respect than Simon and Frederic. Simon was "most devout to Christ," and was "animated by an ardent desire for God's glory and the public good."* In Frederic, on the contrary, "there was an enormity of heresy and the most dreadful blasphemy, to be detested and execrated by all Christians."† Simon was united in the closest friendship with the regular and secular clergy, and his life was devoted to the promotion of national liberty; while Frederic's was spent in crushing liberty in the Italian republics, pillaging and massacring the citizens, profaning churches, and persecuting the clergy. The only influence which Frederic could possibly have exerted over Simon, would have been by exciting such horror of his vices and crimes as would have impelled Simon to the practice of the opposite virtues.

A letter of Grosseteste's, which is universally ascribed to this period, is a convincing proof of Simon's innocence. For not only does this severe reformer omit all reference to Henry's accusation, but he addresses Simon as one who had made considerable progress in the spiritual life. After consoling him on the lower ground, that "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution,"‡ and that God "scourgeth every son whom He receiveth,"§ he proceeds to inculcate the higher degree of patience; saying,

To the just, tribulation is what pruning is to the vine, ploughing to uncultivated ground, washing to dirty cloths, the healing though bitter potion to the sick, hammering to vessels not yet fully shaped, the purifying fire to gold. Therefore, to beholders the present suffering and tribulation is not so much matter for sorrow, as the glory, which is the future fruit of the discipline of tribulation, is for joy. Wherefore, according to the interpretation and properties of your name, suffer tribulation in humble obedience, and ascend by the steps of humility to the summit of the strong mount, *i.e.* Christ, who is the mount on the summit of mounts, and the virtue of God the Father. In order that, contemplating every kind of adversity in Him, "even to the death of the Cross, for which cause God also hath exalted Him, and hath given Him a name which is above all names,"|| you may be ready, in imitation of Him and in the hope that fruit may arise from tribulation, to bear all your trials with unshaken and undaunted fortitude.

Finally, the bishop promised to intercede for Simon with the king.¶

* Brewer, "Monumenta Franciscana," Epistolæ Adæ de Marisco, Ep. 6, p. 86; Ep. 99, p. 225.

† Matt. Par., p. 482.

§ Heb. xii. 6.

‡ 2 Tim. iii. 12.

|| Phil. ii. 9.

¶ Ep. 75, p. 243.

In the spring of 1240 Simon went to the Holy Land. No details of his exploits there have reached us. He must, however, have distinguished himself greatly; for, in June, 1240, the nobles of Jerusalem wrote, asking the Emperor Frederic to appoint him regent.*

We next meet with Simon in May, 1242, in Poitou with Henry, who had been enticed by his stepfather, the Comte de la Marche, into a foolish war with France. Simon excelled in the use of arms and in military experience.† A contemporary says; "He was a man of wonderful forethought and circumspection, pre-eminent in preparing and vigorously carrying on war, abounding in excellent stratagems, not degenerate from his high ancestry."‡ Thus he was among the first soldiers of his day. The Comte de la Marche having betrayed the English army to Louis, Henry was in imminent danger of being taken prisoner at the battle of Taillebourg, and escaped only through Simon's prowess. Most of the nobles left the king in disgust, but Simon was faithful to the last, and returned to England with him only in September, 1243.

Simon's brilliant deeds of arms and chivalrous loyalty, reinstated him in the king's confidence and overcame the prejudices of the barons. In June, 1244, Henry wrote to the Justiciar of Chester, that he could do nothing about the state of the Border counties till he had the advice of his "beloved and faithful Simon de Montfort."§ In the same year, when Simon first took his place in political life, he was chosen to be one of the committee of twelve who were to negotiate with the king on behalf of the barons and clergy.|| But though his name thus appears among the opposition, yet he does not seem to have taken a strong part with them; for the king employed him to plead on his behalf with the bishops.¶ Again, in 1246, his name is attached to the respectful, though strong remonstrance to the Pope, about the large sums demanded by his Holiness, and his giving benefices in England to foreigners to the prejudice of the patrons. But here again there is no evidence that he took any special personal part.** Notwithstanding the appearance of his name on the above occasions, we agree with Mr. Stubbs in thinking, that from 1243 to 1248 he must on the whole have led a quiet life on his own estates.††

* Introduction to "Manners and Household Expenses," &c., p. 19, Ed. Turner; ap. Shirley, p. 33.

† Rishanger, "De Bellis," p. 6.

‡ Chr. Mailros, ap. Blaauw, p. 84.

§ "Royal Letters," vol. ii. Ep. 444, p. 40.

|| Matt. Par., p. 639.

¶ Ibid., p. 640. ** Ibid., p. 701.

†† "Constit. Hist.," vol. ii. p. 64

These five peaceful years give us a picture of Simon in his own home. His marriage had realized the romantic dreams of his youth. Eleanor was the confidante of all his hopes and cares, his constant companion, adviser, and helper. Five sons were given them, and by mutual consent were trained in God's service by Bishop Grosseteste. To these family joys were added the charms of holy friendship. Grosseteste and Adam de Marisco watched over Simon and Eleanor, reproving, advising, exhorting them, and guiding them to the highest ends through the purest motives; while a knot of the most learned and spiritual men in England brought them the pleasures of cultured social intercourse, to which Simon's own education fitted him to contribute.* This rare union of earth's brightest treasures, was crowned and sanctified by Divine love. Simon's life was consecrated to God in the purest religious spirit of chivalry. He assisted at the Offices of the Church both by day and night, and often spent the night in watching and prayer. He was sparing in food and drink. His dress was of plain brown russet, and he wore a hair-shirt next his skin. Amid the temptations of a splendid position and the allurements of a corrupt court, it was his constant prayer that God's grace would keep him spotless from avarice and the desire for worldly goods.† Such was Simon's preparation for his subsequent heroic life.

A great spiritual movement had been originated by Pope Innocent III., and in the Franciscan and Dominican Orders he had found the instruments best suited for his great work of reform. The Franciscans came to England in 1220, and spread rapidly over the kingdom. Their school in Oxford attracted scholars from all parts of Europe, and placed the education of the English clergy in their hands. The first lecturer in it was Grosseteste, then "the very glory of the University,"‡ and the first Friar Minor who taught in it, was Adam de Marisco. Grosseteste thus describes the success of the Franciscans in a letter to Gregory IX. :—

Your Holiness may be assured that in England inestimable benefits have been produced by the Friars; for they illumine the whole country with the light of their preaching and learning. Their holy conversation excites vehemently to contempt of the world and voluntary poverty, to the practice of humility in the highest ranks, to obedience to the prelates and head of the Church, to patience in tribulation, abstinence in plenty; in a word, to the practice of all virtues. If your Holiness could see with what devotion

* "De Bellis," p. 6.

† "De Bellis," p. 6; Chr. Mailros, ap. Blaauw, p. 259.

‡ Wood, "Antiq. Oxon.," l. i. p. 71; ap. Collect. Anglo-Minorit., p. 19.

and humility the people run to hear the word of life from them, for confession and instruction as to daily life, and how much improvement the clergy and the regulars have obtained by imitating them, you would indeed say that upon them who dwell in the land of the shadow of death, hath the light shone.*

To the Franciscans Simon was linked by his friendship with Adam de Marisco. From him he derived his sympathy with the masses of the people, which was characteristic of the Franciscans; while to Grosseteste may be traced his heroic devotion to the popular cause.

Protestant writers commonly describe Simon and his friends as opponents to the Pope and to Catholic doctrine. Thus Shirley says: "It is certainly not likely that . . . Grosseteste and Adam de Marisco would have encouraged him (Simon) to believe, that any act of the Pope could make good a marriage which was really in itself invalid."† On the contrary, it is quite certain that they would have impressed on him the Pope's power of binding and loosing, if he had ever doubted it. The wide-spread fame of their school at Oxford, proves that they were quite sound on what was then a cardinal dogma of the faith of Europe, as it has always been of the Catholic Church.

There is not the least evidence that Simon opposed the Pope's authority. As to his friends, it is certain that both Adam and Grosseteste upheld it. The Franciscan Order was specially united to the Holy See through the vow of obedience to the Pope taken by its minister-general, and the Friars Minors were frequently employed to collect money for his Holiness both in England and elsewhere. Grosseteste's opinions on the subject are expressed in a letter to the king, in which he says, that "not to obey the Pope is like the sin of witchcraft and idolatry."‡

Creighton tells us that the Popes "showed themselves more anxious to bear rule over men's bodies than their souls," and "men's reverence turned from the scheming politicians, who called themselves the successors of S. Peter."§ He speaks, too, of their "robbing England," thinking there was "booty to be had in England," and "plundering the English Church."|| Several of the other writers under review imply similar accusations, though they express themselves with more historical dignity. Here we have another striking proof of the inability of non-Catholic writers to estimate Catholic character and grasp the true position of

* Ep. 58, p. 180. Ed. Luard.

† P. 33.

‡ Ep. 119, p. 341.

§ Pp. 2, 3.

|| Pp. 86, 90, 130.

Catholic Europe at great critical periods. The Pope was at this time engaged in a vital struggle against the Hohenstaufen for the very existence of Christianity and the liberties of Europe. These princes aspired to centralize in their own hands all judicial and executive power, to annihilate municipal liberties, to monopolize trade and education, to found a schismatic Church in Germany,—in fact, to make themselves the true Cæsars of Europe. Far from meriting the charges of political scheming, robbery, avarice, and extortion, there are few positions more heroic than that which the Popes occupied at this period, frequently driven out of their own city by the weak and turbulent Romans, deserted or feebly supported by Christian princes, without money or troops, and yet inflexible and undaunted in opposition to their powerful persecutors. What can be grander than the heroism of Gregory IX., an old man of ninety, who, in 1240, when Frederic II. was approaching to storm the city and his reconnoitring parties were already in sight, never trembled for a moment, but, carrying the heads of the Apostles and the true Cross in procession round the city, refused to enter into negotiations? Awed by this supernatural courage the emperor shrank from encountering the feeble old man, and turned his footsteps through the Abruzzi to Apulia.*

Grosseteste's opinion of the Pope's demands for money, may be seen in his letter to the king already quoted, in which he says, that "so far from there being any cause of astonishment at the bishops' collecting money for him, there would be much more reason for both astonishment and indignation were they not to do so when they see their spiritual father and mother, to whom they owe much more honour than to their natural parents, despoiled of their patrimony, in exile, persecuted, and deprived of their ordinary means of support."†

As to the national grievance, that the Pope gave English benefices to Italians, Grosseteste did not draw the sharp line of distinction between English and foreign priests that modern writers do. The object of his life was to carry out the reforms of the clergy, which the Popes, even in the midst of their greatest difficulties, had so much at heart. He rejected English and foreign priests alike if they were unfit to have a cure of souls, whether their patrons were English barons, Italian cardinals, king, or Pope. At the same time he bade the Friar Minor, John de Dya, provide six or seven clerics from abroad to fill benefices in his diocese, in order that they might preach

* Von Reumont, "*Geschichte der Stadt Rom*," vol. ii. pp. 534-6.

† Ep. 119, p. 341.

by their example, even though they could not speak English.* He fully acknowledged the Pope's right to appoint to English benefices, for he said in a letter to the Legate Otho, that "the Pope and the Roman Church had the power to appoint to all ecclesiastical benefices."† The true idea of his celebrated letter to the Pope, of which Protestants take an erroneous view, was, as Mr. Luard has shown,‡ that the Pope's nephew was unfitted for preferment by his youth. He availed himself of the opportunity to point out the scandals and abuses arising from the Papal provisions; but he studiously guarded against the supposition that he was guilty of disrespect or disobedience, declaring that he was actuated only by the filial honour due by God's command to a father and mother.§ The Pope took the letter in this sense; for, after having read and considered it, he wrote to all the English clergy, expressing his sorrow that the evil times and the great audacity of petitioners should have caused him to make unsuitable appointments; and he adopted the strongest measures in his power to prevent the abuse for the future.|| Mr. Luard, in his valuable preface to Grosseteste's Letters, shows that no one could have exceeded him in his reverence for the Papal power, and for Innocent IV. in particular.

The constant influence of such men as Grosseteste and Adam, could not fail to tell on Simon and his wife. Its fruit at length appeared in deepened compunction and "great alarm" for the sin they had committed by their marriage, in expiation of which they took the cross in 1248.¶ But before they could carry their purpose into effect, the king called on Simon to undertake the government of Gascony.

In a letter written by Adam to Grosseteste while Simon's departure for Gascony was still uncertain, he says:—

I return to your lordship the abridgment which you wrote "*Of the rule of a kingdom and a tyranny*," sealed with the seal of the Earl of Leicester. . . . He has spoken to me of that most salutary design of yours for liberating souls, with which you have been divinely inspired; he praises, extols, and embraces it, beyond what most men would have conceived: and he seems to me prepared by Divine grace to take part in the work, himself and his associates, if any such can be found.**

Matthew Paris also tells us:—

It was reported that the bishop had enjoined on him, in order to obtain remission of his sins, to take up this cause, for which he fought even to the

* Eccleston, c. 14, p. 64. "Monumenta Franciscana," p. 64.

† Ep. 49, p. 144. ‡ Epistolæ, pref., p. 20. § Ep. 128, p. 432.

|| "An. Burton," p. 314. ¶ Matt. Par., p. 742. ** Ep. 25, p. 110.

death; declaring that the Church in England could not be firmly established except by the sword, and positively assuring him that all who died for it would be crowned with martyrdom.*

The coincidence between these two writers leaves scarcely a doubt that the cause of popular liberty, which Simon had so enthusiastically espoused, was imposed upon him as a penance by Grosseteste in commutation of his Crusader's vow.

The expression "liberating souls" is characteristic of a true Friar Minor, and it reveals to us the pure and high motive of Simon's public life.

In the autumn of 1248 Simon set out for Gascony. Here he was initiated into the practice of the principles of government, which he was later to carry out on a larger scale at home. A swift succession of brilliant victories, which made the Gascons "dread him like a thunderbolt,"† and raised his fame to the unrivalled pre-eminence of that of his father, were but the prelude to measures which had for their object the liberation of souls from wrong and violence and the sins which follow in their train. The royal castles were recaptured; forts were erected to bridle the country; robber-bands were broken up; rebel chiefs were hanged, imprisoned, or sent to England for trial by the king; and lawless deeds were punished with such stern, impartial justice, that order was quickly restored, and traders and pilgrims could journey without risk of being plundered and murdered, as formerly.

But, meanwhile, the miserable clique of foreign favourites who surrounded the weak king, took advantage of his suspicious nature to inspire him with jealous doubts of the loyal subject, whose fidelity had already been so nobly proved. A letter, which Simon wrote from Paris to the king on Easter Eve, 1249, when he was on his way back to Gascony after an unexpected visit to England, explains the difficulty of his position.‡ After telling the king that some of the Gascon nobles had made a league and in a few weeks would be in arms, he adds:—

They bear me such illwill because I maintain your rights and those of the poor, that I dare not return to Gascony without having seen you and received your written instructions. . . . I cannot get a farthing of your revenue, for everything is in the hands of the King of France; and I cannot place much trust in the people of the province. On the other hand, it is hard to check the sort of warfare that they carry on, for they ride the

* Matt. Par., p. 998.

† Ibid., p. 879.

‡ "Royal and Historical Letters," vol. ii. Ep. 436 p. 52. Though this letter is anonymous, yet it is unanimously attributed to Simon, because no one else could possibly have written it.

country like thieves by night, laying waste the land, burning, pillaging, and making prisoners of the inhabitants. It is absolutely necessary that I should speak to you before I go thither ; for I have heard that they have given you to understand many evil things of me, and soon they will tell you that I was the cause of the war.

Whether Simon now saw the king does not appear, but his anticipations of the evil influence of his enemies were speedily verified. Gaston de Béarn and his principal adherents, whom he had sent prisoners to England, were pardoned and allowed to return to Gascony, where they immediately appeared in arms, and Simon had to recommence his task. No less than five times was he thus compelled to reconquer Gascony—"such a labour of Sisyphus was the service of Henry."*

When, after spending large sums of his own in the king's service, Simon unexpectedly appeared at court on the Feast of the Epiphany, 1251, to obtain aid in men and money, and pressed his suit by reminding the king how badly the Gascons had formerly behaved to himself, Henry gave him the doubtful answer, "By the head of God you have told the truth, Earl, and I will not refuse effective assistance to you, who are fighting so vigorously for me. But loud complaints have reached me that you imprison those who come to you in a peaceable way ; and those whom you send for, as if in good faith, you put to death when in your power."

These charges Simon positively denied ; adding, "My Lord, their known treachery, which you yourself have experienced, renders them unworthy of belief."†

Both secret and public inquiries into Simon's conduct were now instituted. But the charges against him could not be proved. On hearing of these proceedings, he indignantly exclaimed, "How is it, my Lord King, that you incline your ear and your heart to the messages of these traitors, and believe those who have often been convicted of treachery, rather than me, your faithful subject, and thus institute an inquiry into my conduct?" But Henry coldly answered, "If everything is clear, what harm will the scrutiny do you ? In fact, your fame will become brighter by it."

We possess a most interesting series of letters written by Adam to Simon and Eleanor during this period. It is evident from allusions in Adam's letters to other persons, that Grosseteste also was in close correspondence with Simon. But unhappily none of his letters, except the two already given, have reached us. Adam's correspondence, besides throwing light on Simon's religious character, further shows us how

* Shirley, p. 40.

† Matt. Par., p. 810.

warm was the interest taken by the most distinguished English ecclesiastics in all that concerned him, and how great must have been their influence on the political events of the day. One of the earliest of Adam's letters to Simon, seems to have been written on the occasion of the latter's unexpected return to England at Christmas, 1248. After expressing his joy at Simon's return so much earlier than he expected, he continues :—

Act manfully, and strengthen your soul in the Lord, in whom we may confidently hope that as He mercifully despises not those who trust in Him, though unexpected accidents may retard the execution of wise and profitable plans, yet for the honour of His name He will deign to bring them to a prosperous issue, even beyond what we could have hoped for. Though uniform experience affords little confidence that circumspect counsel will be had on the matters about which you wrote to me, yet, by God's grace, it is in no wise to be doubted that, humbling ourselves under the mighty hand of God, we ought to throw all our care upon Him, because He careth for us, and to direct all our actions to the accomplishment of His immutable will.*

To the years 1249-50 may be referred two letters of Adam's, the tone of which proves that they were written during a season of prosperity. He says :—

O most beneficent Earl ! how much purity, holiness, and glory will you not receive in the kingdom of God, in recompense for your indefatigable and successful labours to reform, illuminate, and sanctify His Church by good government ! What can be so pleasing to the Son of God as always to watch for the salvation of souls, for whom, by the shedding of His blood in such agony, He was pleased to redden the saving Cross ? But what avails it to provide for the peace of your fellow-citizens, and not to guard the peace of your own servants and household ? Better is a patient man than a strong man, and he who rules his own temper than he who storms a city. I wonder whether your acuteness will teach you what I mean by these words.†

Shortly after he writes again :—

My former letter seems to your Serenity exaggerated, as if I had said more in your praise than was fitting : but it was not undeserved, though I confess that I have a special affection for you above all mortals. . . . An ignoble mind, it is true, may be elevated to pride by its honours, and cast down to inertness by praise ; but the wisdom of a noble soul is inclined by the one to humility, and by the other is animated to virtue.‡

Another letter seems to have been written when Simon's difficulties were just beginning :—

Because the angel of the Lord surrounds and protects those who fear Him, I hope that amid the dangers of foes, the plots of traitors, and the

* Ep. 138, p. 264. † Ep. 137, p. 264. ‡ Ep. 139, p. 266.

uncertainties of this fluctuating world, you may be kept by the mercy of Him of whom it is written, "The King that sitteth on the throne of judgment scattereth away all evil with his look."* Provided only that, from holy fear of His Divine Name, you carefully preserve in your own person, your soldiers, your servants, and all belonging to your government, devotion to God, unbroken loyalty to men, peace with each other, reasonable opposition to the refractory, and perfect charity to all. God goes before those who fight thus. If the Lord is for us, who will be against us?†

As difficulties closed round Simon, Adam wrote :—

If you have received the answers of broken friendship and feigned affection, what else are you now suffering than what you before expected? The clear circumspection of your wisdom will remember in how many conferences we drummed into each other's ears and placed before our eyes, the execrable shamelessness of seductive cunning such as we now see; although, considering the trustworthiness of courageous fidelity, your wisdom did not think it right to decline the danger of a truly grand undertaking for the imminent suspicion merely of some stupendous dishonesty. . . . This I most anxiously wish, pray, and beseech, that you would studiously procure for yourself the saving comfort of God's Word by frequent examination of the Holy Scriptures, breaking through, so far as it can reasonably be done, the storms and perturbations of distracting cares. I think it would be very suitable to your discretion if you would frequently peruse the twenty-ninth, thirtieth, and thirty-first chapters of the Book of Job, and other passages in the same book suitable to your condition, and with them the delightful commentaries of S. Gregory, as God shall give you opportunity.‡

We possess several other most interesting letters to both Simon and Eleanor, which appear to have been written while Simon's difficulties were daily increasing. But our limits compel us to pass them over, and to confine ourselves to quoting from a long letter which Adam wrote to Grosseteste in 1252.

By this time Henry's mean jealousy, sedulously fed by his despicable parasites, had ripened into violent hatred. The Gascons, perceiving that their only hope of conquering Simon lay with the king, redoubled their complaints, and Henry, catching eagerly at any chance or excuse for disgracing him, summoned him to England. He was now subjected to a trial before the king, bishops, and barons, which lasted from May 9th to June 11th. Adam, who was present, describes it in a long letter to Grosseteste. He tells him that the Gascons were encouraged "day and night, secretly and publicly," to heap accusations on him, while the king assailed him with "reproaches, taunts, and immoderate invectives."

* Prov. xx. 8. † Ep. 120, p. 266.
VOL. XXIX.—NO. LVIII. [New Series.]

‡ Ep. 120, p. 266.
2 H

But throughout, he observed the moderation of gentleness and the perfection of magnanimity towards both his lord and his adversaries. I know not that from the remotest times such manifest frowardness had ever been shown to any one, whether noble or ignoble; while very few, except my Lord of Worcester, Lord Peter of Savoy, and Lord Peter de Montfort, stood faithfully by him.

All the English prelates and barons, and even the king's brothers, however, openly praised his courage, fidelity, firmness, and just intentions. Simon refuted each of the charges against him by written documents; and a number of persons who had been with him in Gascony proved that this conspiracy had been got up against him only because he had done his utmost to restrain the sacrileges, homicides, and violence which were being constantly committed. The overwhelming evidence compelled the king to give judgment in his favour, and the "sentence was received with unanimous acclaim of assent" by all the barons.

Notwithstanding, after the interval of a single night, the attack on him recommenced, "the king raging in wrath, and those wicked men hissing at him in their falsehood" for several days and nights.* In the heat of the altercation, the king having called Simon a traitor, the latter gave him the lie, adding, "'Who could believe that you are a Christian? Have you never confessed?' Henry answered, 'I have.' Simon replied, 'But what avails confession without repentance and atonement?' To which the king retorted, 'I never repented of anything so much as I now repent of having permitted you to come to England and hold land and honours here.'"† The biographers quote this incident as a proof of Simon's violent temper and sharp tongue. But, considering the chivalric sensitiveness of knightly honour in that age, and the previous days and nights of badgering, we must differ from them.

No amount of ill-treatment could vanquish Simon's magnanimity. He offered to go with his friends and at his own expense to subdue the Gascons; or, if the king would not let him do so, he asked to be dismissed in the presence of the barons without loss of honour or of money. Henry would not consent to either proposal. But at length, hoping that the chances of war might rid him of him, he dismissed him, saying:—

"Return to Gascony, that you, who are so fond and such a fermenter of wars, may there find enough of them, and obtain your merited reward, as your father did of old." To this insulting speech the Earl answered cheer-

* Ep. 30, p. 122.

† Matt. Par., p. 837.

fully, "I will go thither willingly, nor, as I believe, will I return thence until, ungrateful though you are, I bring these rebels into subjection to you, and make your enemies your footstool."* Then, strengthened by the fear, and animated by the love, of the Divine name, placing all his hope upon Him who does not desert those who trust in Him, disciplined to obedience by what he had suffered, rejoicing and confiding in the protection of the Highest, he crossed with his eldest son to Boulogne on the 16th of June, 1252.†

Simon once more reduced the province to order. But the Gascons continuing their complaints, Henry, in order to please them, dismissed him early in 1253.

He now retired to France where a splendid career was opened to him. Blanche, the Queen Regent, had died at the close of the preceding year. The French nobles pressed him to accept the office of Seneschal and govern the country during Louis IX.'s absence in the East. But, immovable in his fidelity to the king who had called him traitor, he twice refused their tempting invitation.

When Henry arrived in Gascony in June, 1253, he found the whole province in open rebellion, and after trying vainly to subdue the rebels, he was obliged to summon Simon to his aid. In obedience to Grosseteste, who was now on his death-bed, and "prompted by the spirit of charity and humility, which passes the bounds of human feeling, to return good for evil,"‡ Simon forgot the insults lately heaped on him, and, going to Henry's assistance, for the sixth and last time subdued the Gascons.

During the next four years we hear of his being sent on an embassy to France. Twice also we find him in collision with William de Valence, the most lawless of the king's half-brothers. But otherwise, he seems to have spent this time chiefly in his own home, from which the call of duty alone could draw him forth.

Up to the year 1258 Simon had not taken a prominent part in politics. But a general feeling of confidence in him seems to have been spreading. His magnanimity and constancy were a marvel even to his enemies; and it was universally known, that when he had once sworn he was as immovable as a pillar, and neither threats, promises, gifts, nor flatteries could make him draw back from his word.§ Grosseteste had died in 1253, and Adam in 1257. Thus he stood alone when the time came for him to execute the task of "liberating souls," which they had imposed upon him. A terrible famine,

* Matt. Par., p. 844.

† Matt. Par., p. 879.

‡ Ep. Adæ 30, p. 122.

§ "De Bellis," p. 6.

which raised the sufferings of the people to an unendurable pitch, brought on the crisis.

Modern writers treat of this national struggle as a great step in the advance of constitutional government. But no such idea crossed the minds of the barons, and least of all Simon's. His sole object was the religious one of liberating souls from oppression and sin. His views were essentially conservative, and it was only by falling back on old national customs and chartered rights, that his genius led him to the measure on which now rests his fame.

The struggle divides itself into two periods under two different leaders. The work also was twofold, consisting of reforms of the king's conduct as feudal lord, and as supreme judge—the first affecting the barons, and the second the great mass of the nation.

During the first period Gloucester was at the head of the barons. The defect in the scheme of government now adopted at Oxford, was its narrowness, for it merely transferred despotic power from the king to a limited number of the barons, and even excluded many of those who had hitherto attended Parliament. Simon at first refused to sign the Provisions, but at length he took the oath, saying, "By the arm of S. James, though I take the oath last of all and against my will, yet will I keep it inviolate." The redeeming points of the work were the appointment of a Justiciar, Chancellor, Treasurer, Sheriffs, and Knights who were to be elected in each county to lay complaints against the sheriffs and others before the Justiciar. But this part of the work, on which depended the redress of the grievances under which the masses of the people groaned, was not so effectually carried out as the former; for the obvious reason, that in many cases the barons themselves were the oppressors. As early as February, 1259, there was a quarrel on this subject between Simon and Gloucester, who objected to the visitation of his estates. Again, in October, the community of the bachelors or knights, i. e. the lesser barons and other freeholders, who formed a large middle class, complained to Edward, that whereas the king had done all that was required of him, the barons had fulfilled none of their promises.

The popular section of the baronial party was also weakened by Simon's frequent absence in France, where he was negotiating a treaty for the final surrender of the French provinces lost by John. He has been accused of selfishness for supporting Eleanor's demand for a share of the money given by Louis in compensation, and for the payment of Henry's long-standing debts to her. But Louis upheld her claim. Simon

acted with his usual generosity, even resigning his lien on Bigorre, which he held in pawn for his expenses in Gascony.

The split in the baronial party inspired Henry with hope. In 1261 he produced a bull from Pope Alexander, absolving him from his oath to the Provisions. But Alexander's death prevented his acting on it. This step united the barons, and they summoned three knights from each county south of the Trent to a Parliament at St. Albans. The king, not to be outdone, summoned them to a Parliament at Windsor. But it is doubtful whether they attended either Parliament. Gloucester soon fell back to the king, and Simon went abroad, declaring that he would rather die without a foot of land than be a perjurer and draw back from his oath.*

In 1262, Henry having obtained a confirmation of the bull of absolution from Pope Urban, threw off all restraints, replaced the barons' Justiciar and sheriffs by his own creatures, and revived all the worst abuses. In July Gloucester died. Simon, who was called "the key of England that had locked out the aliens,"† was now pressed to assume the leadership. He at once assented, declaring that he was "equally ready to die among bad Christians fighting for the Holy Church, or among Pagans as a sworn Crusader."‡

With the year 1263 the second period of the national struggle begins. Many of the barons now went over to the king. It is commonly said that the more moderate were with Henry, and the younger and more violent with Simon; and, also, that his imperious temper, both now and in the following year, alienated many. But it was not a question of moderation or of temper. The first principles of government were at issue. Besides the original question as to the king's right to govern despotically, there had arisen the further questions whether the barons had a similar right, or whether, in the "purgation of errors" and "regulation of customs,"§ they were bound to act for the interest of the whole community and after consultation with them? This was the point of division between the two sections of the baronial party, and no clever management could possibly have reconciled them.

The object and views of the barons who deserted Simon, had been declared by the government they had established at Oxford. Simon's opinion and aim are expressed in a Latin poem of the time, in which the whole question of the seat and duties of sovereignty and the ultimate object of government, is dis-

* "Annal. Dunst., p. 217.

† "De Bellis," p. 10.

‡ "Oxenede Chr.," ap. Blaauw, p. 84.

§ "Political Songs of England," p. 102, lines 597-8. Ed. Thomas Wright.

cussed. The conclusions arrived at are, that "the people is not the king's, but God's";* that "the first place is to be given to the community";† that "the community should advise, and what the generality think, should be known";‡ and that "it concerns the community to see what sort of men ought justly to be chosen for the utility of the kingdom."§ The further question as to what were the laws of the realm, which at this time had arisen throughout Europe in consequence of the revival of the study of the Roman civil law, is also answered. The old Roman law was based on Cæsarism; while the old law of England rested on the free principles of Teutonic customs and the Church's legislation. Thus it is stated in the above poem, that the laws are "the customs of their own kingdom, which have been bequeathed from father to son,"|| and "are best known" to the community.¶ And when the Bishop of Chichester tried to mediate before the battle of Lewes, Simon said to him,—

"Choose the best men who have a lively faith, who have read the Decretals, or who have taught in a becoming manner theology and sacred wisdom, and who know how to regulate the Christian faith. Whatever they may resolve by sound doctrine, or fear not to decree, they shall find us ready to agree to." But a voice from the crowd of courtiers answered, "See, now the soldier is to give way to the sayings of clerics! The military order subjected to clerics, is debased."**

Thus the governing idea of Henry's party and of Cæsarism, was expressed.

We still continue to hear of the Provisions as the object for which Simon contended. But it should be noticed, that this did not refer to the form of government established at Oxford, which the Pope had condemned as derogatory to the king's sovereignty, and the revival of which Simon neither attempted nor desired, but only to the Provisions which were founded on the national charters and guaranteed freedom of person and property.

A striking feature of Simon's conduct at this time was his persevering efforts, in spite of ever-recurring treachery and falsehood, to avoid bloodshed. His military genius could have easily placed the whole kingdom at his mercy. He, however, not only abstained from warfare on a great scale, but he seized every opportunity to obtain peace. Early in 1263, when a collision between Edward and some of the barons was imminent, he hurried over from France and issued a pro-

* Line 759.

|| Line 770.

† Line 847.

¶ Line 767.

‡ Lines 765-6.

** Lines 198, 246.

§ Line 776.

clamation that he would observe any truce which Edward might grant. The following Whitsuntide he offered that the Provisions should be modified by mutual consent, with the sole reserve that the article as to aliens, which involved "nothing but what was the rule in all countries of the world, should be left intact."* Later, when the desultory warfare was in his favour, he again offered Henry the same terms, which the latter reluctantly accepted. Once more, in the following December he consented, for the barest chance of peace, to refer their differences to Louis's arbitration, notwithstanding his own conviction, expressed to Louis in the preceding February, that "though Henry desired nothing but what was good, several of his council did not care for peace, and would not willingly forward it."†

Louis' sentence, known as the Mise of Amiens, called forth a general burst of indignation; for without even entering into the case of the barons, it was absolutely in Henry's favour, with the sole reservation of the charters granted before 1258. It was ascribed to bribery, or the influence of the Queens of France and England. Louis was said to have been forgetful of his own honour, to have extended the power conceded to him to things not belonging to the Provisions, and not to have kept God and the truth before his eyes.‡ Even the royalist Wykes calls the sentence less wise and prudent than was fitting.§ Simon and his friends protested that the question of aliens had not been submitted to arbitration; and they argued that Louis, by ruling that the charters were to be observed, compelled them to uphold the Provisions, which were only the logical consequence of them.||

London, the Cinque Ports, all the other towns, the clergy, the students at Oxford, the whole of the middle classes, the young Earl of Gloucester, and most of the younger barons, took part with Simon. But many of his old adherents, and among them Henry of Almaine, son of Richard of Cornwall, now deserted him. Undaunted, however, by these defections he exclaimed, "Though all should leave me, I and my four sons will stand fast for the just cause which I swore to defend, for the honour of the Church, and for the welfare of the realm."¶

At Brackley he made still another attempt for peace through several bishops and the French ambassador, offering

* "Lib. de Ant. Leg.," 58, ap. Prothero, p. 246.

† "Royal Letters," vol. ii. Ep. 599, p. 242.

‡ "Annal. Worcester.," p. 448; "Annal. Dunst.," p. 227; Matt. Par., p. 992.

§ P. 139.

|| Rishanger "Chron.," p. 11. Ed. Riley.

¶ "De Bellis," p. 17.

to accept the Mise of Amiens, if the king would give up the article about the aliens. But Henry indignantly broke off the negotiation and an appeal to the sword was unavoidable. Success was at first on the royal side. But, not discouraged, Simon renewed his attempts for peace through the bishops of London and Gloucester; and in consideration of the turn of fortune against him, offered £30,000 in reparation of damages, and for the observance of the Provisions. Finally, the day before the battle of Lewes he authorized the attempt of the Bishop of Chichester, already mentioned. But his overtures were met by the scornful answer, "They shall have no peace unless they all put halters about their necks, and deliver themselves up to us to be hanged or to be drawn."*

The same religious spirit which has already been seen in Simon, continued to animate him. A contemporary tells us, that, "like another Josias, he sought after justice as the medicine of his soul."† The poem already quoted, says, that it was not to gain power, or to promote himself or his friends, or to enrich his children that he strove, but that, "like Christ, he offered himself a sacrifice for many."‡ The night before the battle of Lewes he passed in watching and prayer, "according to his custom," exhorting his soldiers by word and example to confess their sins with humility and contrition, in order that their souls being cleansed from every stain, they might fight with greater courage and with more confidence of victory in the cause of God. He also bade them place a white cross on their breast and back to show that they were fighting for justice. Walter of Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester, was in the camp, and gave absolution to all, promising heaven to those who should die fighting manfully.§

The victory of Lewes placed England for fifteen months in Simon's hands. This brief period did not give him time fully to organize a government. Besides, the memorials of a defeated party are always scanty. Still, we know enough to judge of his spirit and principles. First, we are struck with the purity of his desire to do justice to all, and the magnanimity with which he sought after this end. In the first triumph of victory, far from using his newly-got power to carry out his own pre-conceived notions, he referred the leading points in dispute to Louis, who had so lately disappointed his hopes, and to the Legate of the Pope, who had condemned his party. With singular fairness and generosity he sent Henry

* Latin Poem, line 250.

† Lines 328—331, 346.

‡ "De Bellis," p. 7.

§ "De Bellis," p. 30.

of Almaine, though so closely connected with his opponents, to Louis in September, when he was a prisoner, and again in the following May when he was at liberty, to press the final settlement.* Meanwhile, a general disarmament was ordered. Custodians of the peace were appointed in each county. Tournaments were peremptorily forbidden. The Marchers who continued their depredations, were banished for a year, and the Earl of Derby for a similar offence, was committed to the Tower. Archbishop Boniface, who had fled abroad with the other aliens after the battle of Lewes, was invited to return with the foreign members of his household, and all other foreign clergy who would agree to spend the proceeds of their benefices in England; and compensation for injuries was promised.† By such vigorous means civil feuds were extinguished, and peace was restored.

Simon's great measure, which has immortalized his name as the creator of the House of Commons, needs no comment. His policy with respect to the royal authority has, we think, not been properly estimated. His aim evidently was to keep it intact, and to avert the anarchy of baronial rule. So anomalous was his position, and so great were the difficulties of this task, that only perfect singleness of intention and great magnanimity could have induced him to undertake it. The king was incapable of governing. He had been the mere tool of worthless favourites, who had made it their boast that "the king willed always what they willed, but they did not will what the king willed and ordered."‡ These favourites Simon now replaced by wise counsellors, and he himself never left Henry, hoping thus to regain his old influence over him. At the same time he treated him with great respect, and all public acts were done in his name. His expenses were restricted till his debts should be paid, in order "that he might be able to live without oppressing the poor."§ The royal castles and all public offices were placed in trustworthy hands. But it was openly declared that these measures were intended to be only temporary.|| When after Simon's death his possessions were confiscated, the only addition found to have been made to them, was the castle of Chester, which he had exchanged for a portion of his hereditary domains in Leicester-shire of equal pecuniary value. The attitude of Richard of Cornwall and his son justifies us in presuming that they appreciated his conduct; and Edward professed to be satisfied.¶

* Chr. Roff. ap. Blaauw, p. 211; Rymer, i. p. 810.

† Rymer, i. p. 786.

‡ "De Bellis," p. 4.

§ Ibid., p. 37.

|| Ibid., p. 42.

¶ Ibid., p. 41.

But it was only natural that the barons, disappointed of their expected booty, and finding themselves under a stronger rule than they had ever known, should have accused him of selfish greed and ambition. If, as Shirley says, it was something which passed in the Parliament of March, 1265, which gave deep offence to Gloucester and his friends and caused their secession,* there can be no doubt that their feudal pride also revolted from sharing their power with those whom they despised as boors and clowns.

The support of the Holy See alone could have enabled Simon permanently to hold his ground. Unhappily, that support was denied him; and, during the last few months of his life he was formally under the Papal ban. It is, however, almost certain that he did not in will rebel against the Holy See. His connection with Grosseteste and Adam, the Papal banner which, by his order, floated at Northampton, beside those of the barons,† his submission to Pope Urban's condemnation of the Provisions and confirmation of the Mise of Amiens, his reference of his cause in the hour of victory to the Papal Legate, and his appeal to the Pope against the Legate's unfair excommunication, all declare how great was his reverence for the authority of Christ's Vicar. His appeal was never heard. The Legate became Pope Clement IV.; and on Holy Thursday, 1265, he spoke the sentence of excommunication in the Church of Perugia. But there is no mention of it in English records; and probably it was known in England, as it is to us, only through the Papal bull, which was not signed till more than a month after Simon had gone to render his account at a higher tribunal.‡

The falsehood and treachery of Edward and Gloucester brought about his fall. But in death he conquered. For the seed which he sowed, sprang up and brought forth the fruit of constitutional liberty, which at a later period grew up in its full maturity. The long list of miracles wrought at his tomb and the Office to his honour, tell us of the crown which monk and layman would fain have placed over his grave; while the national "Lament,"§ which was written immediately after the battle of Evesham, couples his name with that of S. Thomas of Canterbury, as gaining in death a glorious victory.

* P. 56.

† Blaauw, p. 107.

‡ Rymer, i. p. 786.

§ "Political Songs," p. 125.

ART. VIII.—RECENT GERMAN THOUGHT—ITS INFLUENCE ON MR. TYNDALL.

Geschichte des Materialismus. Von F. W. LANGE. Iserlohn : Baedeker. 1876.

Hartmann, Dühring, und Lange. Ein Kritischer Essay. Von HANS VAHINGER. Iserlohn : Baedeker. 1876.

Geschichte der Philosophie. Von ALBERT STÖCKL. Mainz : Kirchheim. 1875.

HERACLITUS taught that all things are in a flux. Mr. Tyndall believes that we (and the universe along with us) shall melt into the infinite azure of the past. The stream that flows, the clouds that melt—these are the pitiful figures of all reality ; for neither in heaven nor upon the broad earth can we find substance or essence, or the thing in itself which might resist annihilation. Sooner or later must the world's epitaph be written : "Fuit." And if there is no repose, if nothing abides, nothing is solid, then there is no God, and religion becomes a pleasant or a terrible imagination. We dream ; let but our dreaming be noble, full of all beauty and grace, whether it range amongst the forms of science, or the ancient religious myths, or the hopes and aspirations which give a zest to the common life. Could we, indeed, transcend phenomena, and arrive at the essence, our case would be entirely different. But this we can never accomplish, and life is but a passage from one delusion to another.

Time is a dream and eternity a fable. Such is, in brief, the doctrine which Professor Tyndall has, with rare pathos, advocated in most of his essays. Whether the fitting name for it be atheism or pantheism we do not inquire ; but of one thing we are sure, that it is not and cannot be exhibited as a form of Theism. It is, at best, an indolent doctrine, such as the Lotos-eaters might have welcomed ; once become the popular religion, it would seem nothing but a gross and sensual unbelief, the scientific justification of every passion and of all that is now forbidden as against the moral law. In spirit, in tendency, in assumption, it is the peremptory denial of that Natural Religion which the Gospel takes for granted, and, by obvious consequence, it is the denial of Catholic Christianity. If we must needs give it a theological name, we will call it Buddhism. For, as we understand, that time-worn creed acknowledges no God, puts

aside the immortality of the soul, looks upon all the universe as empty seeming, teaches the philosopher a stoical morality (which degenerates into materialism amongst the people), and considers that the desirable end of all things is their absorption in Nirvana. Change the scene and the costume from India to England, add some finely-devised apparatus for experiments upon matter, instead of Oriental take Western eloquence, and you have altered the accidents but left the thing itself intact. Merely, instead of the contemplative sage, you have an essayist like Hume or a *savant* like Tyndall.

Readers will not say that this indictment is ambiguous, but they may hesitate to accept it as true. Buddhism is an historical religion, the articles of whose teaching are fairly well known, and our meaning will, therefore, be sufficiently clear. Still we can imagine the difficulty which some must have in representing to their mind's eye Mr. Tyndall as a Buddhist. The thing is too far-fetched; it is grotesque. Where can a scientific man have studied Oriental philosophy? Nay, what can have drawn him to study it even if opportunities had been plentiful? Science does not delight in fantasy, but these Eastern religions are pure fantasy. And on some such ground as this the average student will refuse to believe that we rightly interpret our author.

But surely the matter is not difficult. Phenomenism is the great philosophical doctrine of the day. It is preached all over Europe. It has won so many disciples that there is now a plebeian as well as a patrician class amongst them. It is the favourite topic of lay sermons and secularist lectures. And its religious expression, its result when applied to the problems of God and morality, is simply what we have said, Buddhism. For the creed of an agnostic is antitheism founded on ignorance, and as he is the "enlightened thinker" of the West, so the Buddhist tells us in his very name that he vindicates for himself the enlightenment of the East. "Nescio Deos" might be the motto of both, only they are not vulgar Epicureans; they have attained the lofty heights of a virtue which asks no reward, and, like King Richard in the tragedy, must despair and die. In a consistent philosophy the theory of knowledge determines all the rest; and Phenomenism declares that our professed knowledge is real nescience. Then we ought to abolish positive religion, and set up in its place an atheistic morality. This we take to be the new wisdom as expounded by modern philosophers generally, and by Mr. Tyndall in particular.

However, we grant this wisdom was not derived at first

hand from the East. It has a European home, Germany, that wide Empire of the Air, according to Jean Paul, which the victories of Moltke and Bismarck have so wonderfully brought down out of the clouds. The Germans are a speculative people, and revel in ideas; their satirist Heine playfully observes that ideas abound with them as gold abounded in Eldorado, and are of about as much value. At present they have undertaken to think for all Europe. It is from them that our philosophers have borrowed and are borrowing their systems. Mr. Tyndall is even proud to make known his obligations to Fichte, who died a generation ago, and to Lange, who died the other day. This is the exact state of the case; we are suffering under a Teutonic invasion of ideas which seems likely to end in conquest. Should that be the fate of the English nation, it will mean that Christianity has at length died out amongst us, and that the religion of materialism reigns in its stead.

Englishmen are the last in the world to apprehend danger. They have no love for theories, and cannot believe that opinions in the long run matter so much. But we will not do them the injustice to believe that they care nothing for religion, or that they would willingly deny God and their own souls. Yet to this they must come if Mr. Tyndall's doctrine gains firm hold of science and literature. They may rely on their traditional dulness to abstract considerations—and that dulness is, in a rational community, astounding—but it will not endure. Or even though it should endure, how sad will be the spectacle of a nation in which the cultured and the thoughtful have abandoned religion to the mere multitude! Worse than this has happened in Germany; for the lower classes—of course, we mean the Protestant lower classes—have ceased to frequent the churches, to have their marriages solemnized, or their children baptized. They are not philosophers, but they can read and write, and they can put in practice what the philosophers recommend. The natural course of things in England seems likely to be that educated men will give up believing in God altogether. But before they take Mr. Tyndall's advice, it might benefit them to look over the pages which we are going to review. They do not know, perhaps, what atheism is like when it has once been established.

To the spirit and the letter of Lange's work on Materialism, Professor Tyndall declares himself equally indebted. So much indeed is he in Lange's debt that we, who had read the Belfast Address before the German author, were tempted afterwards to consider Mr. Tyndall a downright plagiarist. But as we said in October last, that is of small consequence. The

Belfast Address has done mischief where Lange could never have penetrated. It is not every one who can preach against God in the presence of the British Association. The advantage of recurring to Lange is, that one sees the drift and the scope, one reads the full enunciation, of those mysterious fragmentary sentences which so exercised Mr. Tyndall's hearers. And as Lange supplies a meaning to the English Professor, so does Vaihinger secure us from mistaking whilst we interpret Lange. All these gentlemen belong to the same school. To speak with the bluntness of our ancestors, they believe neither in God nor devil, but they have contrived to believe in Kant. Christianity, and Theism itself, they regard from the distance, as it were, of a geological period. This, we may suppose, is the height of good manners at Berlin; but if educated Germans no longer speak of Theism except as matter for the historian, we venture to predict that their affectation will meet with its reward. If they will not hear the Scriptures, it is still possible for them to learn from their Positivist brethren that "as a man sows, so shall he reap." How can human power keep anarchy at bay when Providence has withdrawn its help? Blasphemy is the greatest of crimes, and a Socialist reign of terror may be its punishment.

It would seem that Lange has done more than all his contemporaries to bring back the Kantian criticism. He has not, however, kept himself strictly to the negative rôle of a critic; or, perhaps we may say he has laid unusual stress on the synthetic functions of the Reason. This part of Kant's system has been rather neglected, owing to the influence of Schelling and Hegel, who substituted for it a special doctrine of their own. At least, so Herr Vaihinger would allege; and from his point of view we think he is correct. But the Catholic adversary might find it easy to show that there is no real difference between these authors, since they agree in the main article of Phenomenism. We will explain our meaning further on. For the present, it is enough to say that Lange has taken great pains to harmonize Kant's philosophy, and in doing so, has employed a certain kind of construction or synthesis. This gives us that doctrine upon the nature of Religion, Philosophy, and Poetry, which Mr. Tyndall has, to some extent, reproduced. And here is the chief point of interest for most readers.

But though Lange has a numerous following, he is not the only leader of German thought. Several philosophies—we prefer to say, several forms of the same philosophy—dispute the pre-eminence. By comparing and contrasting them Vaihinger maintains we shall get the most absolute and undeniable representation of all that the agencies at work in Ger-

man society have effected, and are likely to effect hereafter. He says ingeniously, and it seems to us with great truth, that the philosophy of a period bears to its history much the same relation which algebra bears to geometry. He does not, of course, mean that a concrete and living organism can find its perfect exposition in any one set of doctrines, or is moving in only one direction; for history denies this with emphatic reiteration. But there is at hand the symbol of the resultant of forces; and such a symbol may well represent German thought now, for the systems in vogue converge upon each other more or less, and all bear away from Catholicity. In addition they furnish, if taken together, a luminous enlargement of Mr. Tyndall's essays; the study of them tells us what will happen under the influence of that spirit which governs him, and will assist us to realize the monstrous doctrines which are said to be an advance upon Christian truth.

Herr Vaihinger has written a strangely attractive book, not very ambitious in appearance, but full of matter, subtle, and to the point. We do not recommend it, for all that. A man must have passed through all the degrees of irreligion before arriving at the calm scepticism of its author, and at the yet calmer atheism of those whom he brings on the scene. We can fancy some one led by innocent curiosity to turn over his pages, and, not knowing what was to be expected in such a volume, reading on and on with a mixed feeling of eagerness to see what more fearful things *could* be said, and of growing dismay at the things that had been said already. But German culture accustoms one to systematic impiety in those whom it subdues, and apart from this, Herr Vaihinger gives information which is very seasonable. When the world is mad, we find it necessary to study the symptoms. Our author does so with a steady eye and a penetrating mind. "*Si fractus illabatur orbis*,"—that, indeed, has come to pass in Germany long since, but the imperturbable critic has out his tablets, and his only anxiety is how he may secure a vividly correct picture of what came after Chaos.

Some one has recommended him, says Herr Vaihinger, to entitle his essay, "*de tribus impostoribus*." Under the circumstances he might have done worse. At all events, if they are not impostors like Mahomet, they claim, like him, to be prophets and founders of a new order of things. It is very hard that every heterodox philosopher must feel called upon to create the universe according to a new design; but nothing less than this do these three undertake. Hartmann and Dühring are fierce antagonists, who happen to agree on some few points, but wish to set up thoroughly different systems of thought and life.

Lange takes his place above them both, and aspires to the dignity of a *deus* or *demon ex machinâ*, who ends the play, and demands our satisfied applause. Not that he solves the mysteries of the world. He has no glorious all-perfect wisdom to bestow upon us, no form of truth to win our admiration and worship. His "*vos valet et plaudite*" consists in a solemn commemoration of our nescience, which began with our being, and can end only with our life. It is seldom that a name brings out the nature of a system; but for convenience sake we may describe Hartmann as an Idealist, Dühring as a Realist, and Lange as a Sceptic. Much as they differ in their speculative tenets, they all have a strong leaning towards Socialism, are all discontent with the present régime even though upheld by the iron will of Prince Bismarck, and all expect or desire a republic in the future. This is a somewhat remote deduction from their primary convictions, but it is sufficiently remarkable. It proves that the political genius of the Germans is far inferior to their literary insight and culture. They feel that immense misery is pressing upon the country; but show themselves incapable of devising any remedy, except one of that renowned species which cures the disease by killing the patient. However, we are losing the thread of our metaphysics.

Kant has divided philosophy into the speculative and the practical, the former of which is concerned with Being, the latter with Action. In other words, we may put two questions to ourselves whilst contemplating the universe, "What is it?" and "Why is it?" We may discuss the formal or the final cause of things. More plainly still, the problem is "What is the Truth?" and "What is the Good?" The three authors answer these questions very differently.

Hartmann and Dühring represent in their opinions and their style the chief aspects of life at Berlin, that great city which is becoming a sort of New Jerusalem for the scientific and literary classes throughout Germany. In the works of Hartmann we view the melancholy, the despair, the pessimism of a cultured society which has worn itself out in searching after pleasure. Hence the Socialism of this writer has a perceptibly aristocratic tinge, like the revolutionary speeches of Mirabeau. Dühring is not less true to Berlin, but he depicts it under another light. He is the advocate of that proverbially cold and corroding intellectualism, that unscrupulous rationalism which enters into the very notion of the modern gentleman. But, strange to say, he knows the lower classes intimately and has a deep feeling for them; their sufferings lead him to further every movement towards a revolution, and his

theory is democratic in tendency. He is before all things destructive, pushing analysis as far as it will go in the social and metaphysical orders; and though he does not choose to be called an Hegelian, he is yet lineally descended from Feuerbach and the Hegelian Left. Naturally, then, we may expect him to defend the materialism of contemporary science, and to hold with Comte, if not with Giordano Bruno, in many things.

Dühring's system, on the whole, may be considered, in Ontology Realism, in Ethics Optimism. That is to say, he answers the questions as to the Being and Worth of the universe by affirming that things are really as we see them, and that life deserves, for its excellence, to be cherished, and as far as possible increased in quantity and value. But the reader is not to imagine that Dühring has principles in common with the Scholastics, or with the Catholic philosophy, because he admits a real and a good world. The world here spoken of is merely sensible: Dühring knows nothing of spirit. This material and palpable world, bounded in time and in space, is to him the absolute and the last reality: beyond it there is no God, before it there was no eternity. All our knowledge may be summed up as "the mathematics of matter." It becomes evident that such must be his doctrine, when we remember that the faculty of analysis by which he learns philosophy and science, is the so-called Understanding of Kant, or, as we should say, the faculty of formal logic exercised on absolutely material premisses. The understanding is the Lockian power of sensible reflection. All it can do, therefore, is to represent extension under abstract forms, which, though abstract, are not properly universal. Moreover, he goes on to explain that we possess a synthetic faculty as well, the imagination, which, so long as it obeys "Understanding," is capable of producing an ideal, an æsthetic harmony of the world. But the imagination may rebel, or may forget the material realities which it should keep in view, and then it ceases to have any real value. Now, this pretended harmony (which, like the air-pulsations of music, is not and cannot be spiritual) is the philosopher's religion, or more truly, his God, and so Dühring tells us. But what *we* mean by religion is founded on the recognition of a Creator, spiritual and supreme, and totally distinct from the universe. Dühring coolly says that this is a "pathological delusion," the fantasy of a sick brain. The most perfect expression of natural science, he asserts, is identical with philosophy, is the only true knowledge, and the only possible religion. Thus do we arrive at the "system of reality," the view of nature which takes what is given in sensible experience just as it is given, and without subtlety or hair-splitting, or any foolish

endeavour to colour things so that they may please, is able to "comprehend," but will not seek a transcendental or spiritual explanation. The limits of nature are the limits at once of reality and knowledge. But nature is good and pleasant. Dühring admits the existence of evil, but in details only, not on the whole; and since, according to him, all things are finally one and the same (All-Eine Sein), those who bow to the law of necessity and strive to forget their particular mishaps in sympathy with the universal good, may find the perfect rest which they desire. Beatitude is promised to society; and the truly noble will do all in their power to hasten the period of its arrival. But it never can arrive until Religion and Tyranny (which are alike in nature) have breathed their last. The *ancien régime* must finish. The new epoch is to begin and to continue without God. Dühring will not allow such a God, even, as Comte's Grand-Être. There is to be neither Church nor State, and Christianity must be banished as nothing better than a spiritualistic magic. Hereupon succeeds the Republic of Plato, with little or nothing of its atrocious immorality corrected. The delineation is of a sort which we dare not attempt: but ought not this necessary deduction to be decisive of the philosophy which compels us to make it?

Vaihinger has personified Dühring's thought under the figure of Mephistophiles, the sneering logician whose way it is to deny and to question as often as possible. Hartmann is far more taking, and though he professes the gloomiest of doctrines, there is a touch of genial humour in his writings. He has attracted much notice amongst his countrymen and no little affection. Lange terms him "an afterling of the speculative Romanticism," and it seems clear that he is connected with the Hegelian Right and even with Schelling. If his rival is Mephistophiles, he may be considered as Faust, so says Vaihinger, but we suppose he means Faust on his travels and striving to drown thought in enjoyment. What is very striking, but as we think founded on fact, there are traces of religious earnestness in Hartmann's works, and we have lighted upon opinions of his which resemble Christian teaching. He is not, however, a Christian. One of his best-known works was intended to prove that Christianity is in a state of natural decay, and must perish of itself. But he is no enemy to the faith, if we understand by the term enemy one who would like to see religion at an end. He thinks the Christian Church has need of an infusion of new ideas, and he recommends us to study the Buddhist philosophy. It is foolishly said, but not unkindly meant. He prefers Buddhism himself, because it was the cherished religion of one who is known to be his master, a

man little thought of in his day, but now much celebrated and studied—we mean Arthur Schopenhauer. From him Hartmann has learnt his doctrine of the Unconscious and of the absolute evil.

According to Vaihinger, the philosophy of Hartmann is a combination of Idealism and Pessimism. We have to crave our readers' indulgence for the frequent use of these technical words, but they help the memory, and their signification is more precise than that of any others we might adopt. When, therefore, Hartmann is asked to define the nature of the world, he replies that it is not "absolute Being" as Dühring had said, nor "subjective Seeming," as Lange and Tyndall would say, but "objective Seeming." The world must be affirmed to "exist," but not to "subsist." And it will not last for ever. Day by day it advances to its own destruction. The end of all sensible reality, and of the thinking subject which contemplates it, is simply Nirvana; the great abyss must swallow up the universe. Hence the reality of such an objective seeming becomes very doubtful; and it is the ordinary course to look upon Hartmann as an Idealist—all the more because he declares that the world is only real in its relation to us, but an illusion if compared with the Unconscious out of which it has emerged. The individual, too, has no part assigned him in the play; he merely crosses over the stage, and his exits and entrances are alike unmeaning. All this appears to be Hartmann's genuine teaching. But, some difficulties remain; and though we cannot undertake to say that Hartmann escapes into Realism, we still are not persuaded that he is the unmitigated Idealist they represent. He informs us that the universe may be defined as the intuitions of the unconscious Reason realized; this ought, surely, to throw some light on what he conceives in the phrase "objective Seeming." Is he trying to describe the reality which is a true existing substance, but is not infinite, nor yet self-caused? That which is real in itself and in our thought, but appears as nothing when set face to face with the Illimitable, might be taken for a moment as the created world which Catholic teaching insists upon. So, at least, we *might* interpret our writer. But, if his view concerning the world has a remote and unsteady resemblance to the Scholastic, he goes utterly wrong when speaking of the world's First Cause.

Spinoza and Schopenhauer (to say nothing here of Leibnitz) supply those thoughts in which the theology, if we may call it so, of Hartmann is rooted. He lays down a philosophical teaching which, in his opinion, we must accept as metaphysics; and its purpose is to examine and define the attributes of that which came first (the *Ur-Etwas*), the ground of all things

that are. This absolute first is the Unconscious. It eternally subsists, and is even pure spirit; it is the perfect explanation or reason of the Universe, and is, consequently, its own reason. This seems to promise a restoration of the Natural Theology in which Christendom has for so many ages believed. But Hartmann very speedily disappoints our hope. The absolute ground of all things is nothing in itself; it is the empty deep of possibility—in Scholastic terms it is *pura potentia*, not that which is aught real, but that which may become everything and all things together. Hartmann has been considered a materialist, and with some show of justification; but he does not make matter the first original. This something-nothing, the bare abstract possibility is a sort of willing and striving to be. It has the attributes, such as Schopenhauer imagined them, of Will and Representation, and these do not suffer reduction to any common denominator, though they are founded on one identical thing. But why is this First Cause, which has appeared previously to be a willing and thinking spirit, now degraded by a name like the Unconscious? A spirit is personal, and knows and loves itself; this is its life. How then can the absolute spirit be unconscious? Hartmann answers that in each one of us there is an unconscious substratum, though we are by nature spiritual; he recalls to our memory the obscure perceptions which Leibnitz defended as the ground of consciousness; and he argues that a similar ground must exist in the divine being. The Unconscious is, therefore, a sort of direct and automatic intelligence, ever looking out, never turning back upon itself. In it all things are represented, except only its own essence. Its act is purely transitive, like that of a mechanical force; since, were it otherwise, did the knowledge and love reflect upon the subject which elicits them, we should see resulting thence life and perfect consciousness. But these are to be gained by development, by the production of a world of nature and spirit which differs in outward seeming from the Unconscious, although really one and the same thing with it. The original Will is instinctive, and so the universe arose through a blind impulse which had no rationality in it; creation is an unexplained accident, not the effect of freely-choosing love. In the abyss that was an eternal pain, the pain of want, and to get release from the evil which it knew, the Unconscious ventured upon other evils, far more terrible, of which it had not even a dim conception. How that which has no perception of itself could perceive that it was in pain, we are not informed. Suffice it that the Deep—the Gnostic Bathos, surely—gave rise to the whole universe; the Unconscious began his journey upwards along all the steps

of nature, of organism, and of life, till he appeared in man as a thinking, conscious, unhappy spirit. To the silence which reigned in the abyss succeeded the harsh music of the struggle for existence. First, came Nature, then History; both are the experience of the Unconscious, and both tell us of his failure to achieve happiness.

It is here that the current materialism receives an interpretation from Hartmann. Although asserting (by what seems to us a contradiction) that the Unconscious is capable of design, and has, in fact, arranged and governed the world according to a plan, he admits the Darwinian natural selection; what is more, he admits the *generatio æquivoca* which scientific men of all shades of doctrine so unanimously and even scornfully reject. We, of course, do not for a moment allow that the production of the living from the absolutely non-living is possible, we think it a physical and metaphysical absurdity. But Hartmann desires to be on good terms with Hæckel and Darwin. His account of the material world is therefore materialistic. And, by a like consequence, man is said to have the brute for his progenitor, and there is no such thing as a soul distinct from the body. The principle of thought, on Hartmann's view, is the brain. But we must never forget that Hartmann takes up a Kantian position in the theory of knowledge. His thought, as regards the essences of things, is agnostic; his language only is materialistic. He would not contend that essence is matter or extension: the ultimate ground and substance is a logical notion, that non-being which is emptiness itself. Although the immediate explanation is that of modern science, there needs another explanation still, and that is comprehended in the Buddhist doctrine that all things come out of nothing, and that thither they return. The last word is not Materialism; it is Phenomenism.

Nature and History, then, are the enterprize of the Unconscious searching for perfect happiness. And nature grows by adding species to species under the laws which Darwin has traced, or, at least, has conjectured. But, what is History? It is the "*chronique scandaleuse*" of all that man has had to suffer—an immeasurable tableau of catastrophe, disaster, and ruin, in which everything has been attempted and everything has failed. Life is merely pain, beatitude is a dream never to be realized. Wherever there is consciousness there is misery. Had the Unconscious known so much as this, it would not have created the world; but it wrought in ignorance. Before, it suffered only in itself: now it suffers in all men, and in all living things. But, as Schopenhauer suggests, it requires a long apprenticeship in this world ere we come to understand

that our pain is essential to our life itself, and is not the accident of any state. To be is to be unhappy : this is the secret which philosophy teaches to a few. The world's history is a record of how men have refused to believe in pain ; how they have struggled with it and fled from it ; how they have invented pleasures, and sought the perfect bliss. Hartmann thinks it his melancholy duty to define their history as so many "Stages of Illusion"—first, the Pagan, then the Christian, lastly, the Modern. At all times the sum of miseries has far exceeded the sum of pleasures. But the Pagans hoped to gain beatitude by surrendering themselves to nature, and the Christians feigned a beatitude in a world which they had not seen—the fairland of heaven. The moderns imagine that to advance art and science, and social life, and to make the most of what is seen, forgetting the unseen, will bring them to a golden age of republican equality, freedom, and fraternity. All this Hartmann accounts a delusion. Nature cannot satisfy the heart ; there is no world beyond the grave, and Socialism will never do away with the evils of work, suffering, hunger, and death. It is an irreversible decree that pain and life are to spring up together, and to increase in the same proportion. What has the enlightened thinker to conclude ? Simply, that we must despair. The world is the best of all possible worlds : he frankly concedes it ; but the best is very, very bad, and worse than none at all. Our comfort is to know that it cannot last. Science proves that the soul is not immortal, and our daily experience shows all things hastening to decay. The world's redemption is its deliverance from existence, and the absorption of all its elements in the Unconscious. Where silence was before, silence will be again. When all the stages of illusion have had their day a grand catastrophe will come upon the universe, and the token of its advent is to be the triumph of Socialism. The last years of history will witness a socialistic republic, and then the cup of human misery will be full. We think so, indeed ; who could forecast any other issue of so detestable a philosophy ?

But thus we are brought into the presence of that problem which Hamlet has made so familiar to us :—

Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,
Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
And, by opposing, end them.

Since we live in a wretched world, and to die is to escape from it, what should hinder us our escape ? Hartmann replies

"sympathy." He would have us keep in view the story of Prometheus, who, at the cost of his own pain, brought light and life to "the human mortals"; he would have us be brave, virtuous, noble, self-sacrificing, perfect in all good. But we can see no reason. The aspirations of mankind are all in the weary line:—

Ich wollt' es wäre Schlafzeit, und alles wär' vorbei.*

How can the individual be required to bear a life-long pain, when society is making all speed to end its misery by annihilation? There is in this the logic neither of hope nor of despair. And the sympathy invoked is a grotesque misapplication of feeling. We help one another to happiness because we love one another; but what sort of a love is that which proposes to lessen the difficulty of suicide? If there is nothing to hope, why should we exert ourselves? Why not be, in spite of Hartmann's prohibition, idle lookers-on at "the Carnival of Existence"? Hartmann says it is our fate to live in hope; then, we conclude, there must be something worth hoping for; "*Sic transit miseria mundi*" is *not* the inscription of the last day. What we always, and of our own accord desire, is that which Providence has designed shall come to pass: "new heavens and a new earth in which justice shall dwell." The absolute misery of the latest ethics is as false as the absolute nothing of the latest metaphysics. They are both a *reductio ad absurdum* worked out by the modern philosophers from their own premisses.

Great as the opposition may seem, great as upon some points it certainly is, between Hartmann and Dühring, their doctrines are in agreement on the sum of reality acknowledged. Beyond the sensible and material, Dühring affirms there is nothing whatever; the universe is all, and matter is all. Hartmann, again, even if it should be proved that he admits a true and real universe, reduces all things to the Unconscious, as to their origin and foundation; but this, we have seen, is a logical notion, and no more; it is the possibility which is nothing in itself, and has no contents, no substance, no actual perfection. The Unconscious is Nirvana, the uttermost abstraction, nor does it suppose a preceding reality. Whilst the orthodox teaching, whether we take it from Aristotle, or Plato, or S. Thomas, or Kleutgen, would have us refer sensible phenomena to their substance, and spiritual acts to *their* substance, and universe and soul to an infinitely perfect, infinitely real God, who is not any of His creatures, it must be evident that the

* Would 'twere the hour for sleep, and all were o'er.

point at issue is not how we shall arrange the scheme of things, but what things there are, how many, and with what essential distinction from each other. Furthermore, the question is, do we need to explain our whole experience, objective and subjective, by referring to a mere logic of notions, and so making things depend upon ideas which are not things, or by concluding to the existence of an Infinite Act, a First Cause in comparison with whose reality all things else are like shadows. A Christian affirms God, and the soul, and the world, and that each of these is itself and no other. But Hartmann and Dühring believe that God is the universe, God is the soul, and that apart from these He is nothing. Dühring infers from this belief that we ought to speak only of the world which we see, and to abolish that word God which has introduced so much ambiguity and error; Hartmann infers that we ought to hold all things divine, as being those forms of the Unconscious and its apparitions, of which Spinoza is the accredited prophet.

This understood, it follows that Lange is practically at one with Hartmann and Dühring, for he, too, denies us any real knowledge of the supersensible. But he professes to think the question beyond our powers, whether of intuition or inference; and his aim, as we have already said, is to convince us that we ought to rest in a negative solution. He takes up and completes the enumeration of faculties as they are given in Kant's Criticism, but deals more largely with the synthetic than the analytic functions of them. He considers that there is a distinction of essence between Science and Philosophy, so great that these two sorts of knowledge do not belong even to the same genus. Science is a product of the Understanding (*Verstand*); Philosophy is a product of the Reason (*Vernunft*); in other words, Science is a prose explanation of particular phenomena, but Philosophy is a poetical dream on the universal essence. As both are subjective, neither is true. Our various faculties seek and attain contentment in exercise, but we are not to imagine that they arrive at truth or reality. Materialism satisfies the faculty of Science, Understanding; Idealism satisfies the higher faculty, Reason; still the product of the one function brings no happiness, no perfection to the other. If man were only scientific, he would be a materialist; if he were only poetical, he would be an idealist: the misfortune is that he cannot help being many things in one. He has need of clear, well-defined sensible knowledge; none the less, he has need of religion too. He lives by sense and imagination, the one bringing him across a phenomenal world, the other lifting him up to surmise and prophesy about a world of things which are

not phantoms. But he knows the first more securely than the second, or he seems to know it more securely so long as he employs the scientific faculty as an instrument. The unpardonable error which orthodox philosophy commits is to make all our knowledge of a piece, to call metaphysics by the name of science, to assume that the lower faculties learn things objectively, and then to maintain that the highest are concerned with the objective also. But Religion and Philosophy are no more real than poetry; they are forms of poetry, very noble and consoling, to be sure, but only a child would believe that they can tell us of the world which we do not see. That there is such a world it is impossible to affirm or deny with reason; we might as well begin to dispute whether fairyland exists, or Utopia, or any other unreal vision to which the poet has given "a local habitation and a name."

Is then Lange a believer in materialism? His book, which, in the opinion of many, will inaugurate a fresh period of philosophy amongst cultivated Germans, offers large justification of what materialists have held; so much so, indeed, that he writes against Aristotle, Plato, and Socrates with the animosity of a man for whom their doctrine has no attraction. He professes impartiality, but, so far as we have read him, the profession is not sustained throughout. And we say this, mindful that he did wish to be free from bias and to look at his authors from a neutral point of view. But in metaphysics there is no neutrality. However, Lange declares himself against dogma of whatever school or section; he thinks the dogmatic materialist has nothing more solid to go upon than the dogmatic idealist. He is a critic and, therefore, a sceptic. His masters are Kant and Hume. This is precisely the view which Mr. Tyndall has sought to hold,—nescience expounded in terms of matter when we employ the understanding, and in terms of spirit or mind when we delight ourselves with the imagination; but, first and last, nescience.

Our space is narrowing rapidly, but we think it of the highest importance to grasp what has just been said; and to put it with such clearness as may serve our design, we will quote at some length from the recent work of Mr. Leslie Stephen.* Though he is reviewing a doctrine which was published in English books a hundred years ago, there does not need the alteration of a word to obtain a fit expression of that which we combat now in Lange and Tyndall. Mr. Stephen writes:

Hume's scepticism cuts away the very basis of ontological proof. The mind, according to him, is unable to rise one step beyond sensible experi-

* "English Thought in the Eighteenth Century," vol. i. pp. 315, 316.

ence. It can separate and combine the various "impressions" and "ideas": it is utterly unable to create a single new idea, or penetrate to an ultimate world of realities. The "substance" in which the phenomenal qualities of the world are thought to inhere is a concept emptied of all contents, and a word without a meaning. The external world which supports the phenomena is but a "fiction" of the mind; the mind, which in the same way affords a substratum for the impressions, is itself a fiction; and the divine substance, which, according to the Cartesians, causes the correlation between these two fictions, must—that is the natural inference—be equally a fiction. Impressions and ideas, combining and separating in infinite variety, being the sole realities, the bond which unites, and the substratum which supports them, must be essentially unknowable, for knowledge itself is but an association of ideas. Dismiss these doubts, attempt to frame ontological propositions, and the fallacy manifests itself afresh in the futility of the dogma which emerges. Under the form of examining Bayle's criticism on the "hideous hypothesis" of Spinoza, Hume exhibits the inevitable antinomies which beset the reason in its endeavour to soar beyond experience; and, therefore, on his assumption, to transcend itself. Metaphysicians had insisted on the utterly disparate character of mind and matter. The two could not be brought into relation except by the verbal explanation of the divine power. It was only necessary, then, to exhibit this antithesis to show that the doctrine was inconceivable: Mind cannot be resolved into matter, therefore materialism is absurd; but neither can mind be brought into contact with matter, unless mind be itself extended, therefore spiritualism is equally absurd.

How, it may be asked, could Lange propose, after this, any theory of life, or any philosophy? He professed, indeed to have both, but the end of his teaching was pretty nearly this, that things naturally fall into a system which gives us pleasure, and even a relative satisfaction, without, however, raising in us the conviction that the system itself is true. The critical philosophy is but a special form of the universal illusion, possessing in some respects an advantage over ordinary dogmatism. Thus Art, Religion, and Philosophy have only a value as they lift up the mind and soul to a world which never has been nor can be, but which, for all that, is beautiful and desirable beyond words. Plato held that this was the real, though unseen, universe; but Kant and Schiller have schooled us otherwise, and we must say that all the best knowledge is a dream, foreign to science, but needful if we are to live happily. The ideal is not real, nor founded on reality; neither is it due to caprice or voluntary imaginings; it is simply the refuge which nature opens to us from the world's confusion and sorrow. When we turn to things as they are, desolation looks us in the face, we become with the religious men of all ages pessimist in our thoughts, and the soul is overwhelmed with sadness. But we turn

again to the pure and shining forms of perfection within us, and the vision of poetic beauty, justice, and contentment is like summer in the heart. This is how Lange conceives of Religion and Philosophy.

And this is what leads him to say, that in all the particular inquiries now making, the materialist has reason on his side rather than the dogmatic idealist, whilst, on the whole, it may be that the latter is nearer to the unknowable truth than the former. How Lange can know what the probabilities are when he has not an atom of certitude to start from is not so easy to comprehend, but we think we see the truth which he has distantly indicated. All knowledge is a help towards learning something about God, but religious knowledge is a more successful attempt than any other at an account of what God is and of what He has made the universe to be. This is accurately true, but only on the supposition that some religious creed is divine and is not a delusion. Religion may be an economy, an imperfect representation of the Infinite; but what we cannot admit, and what Lange persistently holds, is that religion is a fable.

To few, says Vaihinger, is given the steadiness of entire scepticism; human nature tends of itself to one or other side. Nothing, certainly, should be more trying than the unstable equilibrium induced by Kant, the swaying now towards a crude material philosophy, and now towards a superlatively Platonic idealism. And, in consequence, whenever Lange ceases to watch himself, he dogmatizes like the rest of men. He is deficient in speculative consistency and thought. We may allow his keenness and perspicuity in noting the opinions which obtain amongst materialists; he shows, also, a rare acquaintance with schools and creeds, and, generally, with their historic surroundings. But it is not possible to rightly understand the doctrines of ancient or modern times if we always shirk the decisive question, "What is truth?" Lange has the vices of a genuine Kantian. He can teach nothing absolutely, but must wait till some one has made him a present of a theory to operate upon. He feels at home when registering objections, exposing blunders, holding up to scorn the innate contradictions of every system hitherto produced. He thinks he may criticize at his own rate, but we should be glad to learn how there can be any criticism at all unless there is first a theory (explicit or implicit does not matter) to govern it. For if a proposition is declared untrue, that must be because its contradictory is known to be true. But the Kantians answer nothing when this is urged; they calmly go on delivering judgment as from a chair of infallible certitude.

Vaihinger, for instance, will travel with any man along the road of sceptics, but this does not hinder him from laying bare the inconsistencies which his reason (not his Kantism) enables him to perceive in Hartmann and Dühring. Much that he remarks is striking, and, we think, justified by his arguments. But the ghost of Kant hovers near us, and we know not how to reply when it whispers that even criticism must be phenomenal, and its judgments no less deceptive than the systems which they condemn. If, then, we argue that the so-called contradictions of orthodox writers are not real but seeming, that is, are not contradictions at all, what can be said in answer?

Hence the air of unreality, of dreaminess, which pervades the history of Lange and the essay of Vaihinger, nay, which has crept, we fear, over some portion of our present exposition, in spite of our best efforts to the contrary. The most solid arguments dissolve when those who advance them assure us that they are nothing but an imaginative arrangement of certain speculative dice, ingenious throws which neither have nor can have scientific value. After tiring ourselves with the unsatisfactory theories of Hartmann and Dühring, what do we get from the critics that is better than a sleeping-draught to quiet our ignorant passion for truth? Lange preaches the philosophy of despair—and so does Tyndall—as surely, though not as energetically, as Schopenhauer, or the disciple who is now rivalling Schopenhauer in his denial that God is good. To say that very possibly things are as Hartmann represents them, but that we can live pleasantly by supposing otherwise, is to be cynical as well as cruel. We are advised to think of the "Stand-point of the Ideal," which is Lange's name for his new religion, as Goethe thought of a celebrated episode in Wilhelm Meister ("the Confessions of a Beautiful Soul"), that "it all rests altogether upon the noblest illusions and the tenderest interchanging of the unreal with the real." Religion, in fact, means that we have some very fine feelings which we are bound to cherish. And to put it briefly, as well as convincingly, Lange informs us that we may have a cosmology, so long as we take care not to hold a real world; and a metaphysics, so long as we refuse to decide whether there is anything at all; and—further than this folly cannot go—a Religion, so long as we do not believe in God. Religion without God is the great ideal towards which Humanity is striving. Even Christian mythology will still be acceptable, still furnish the occasion for much devout and æsthetical poetizing, if its dogmatic exclusiveness and rigidity can be done away with. Lange would preserve the ritual and the liturgical offices which have remained intact since

the Reformation; he would join in singing hymns to Christ and in celebrating the Passion, but with the understanding that it is all to mean nothing objective or historical. Since Christianity is the finest exhibition of art and genius in religion, he thinks it will survive the assaults of the critical period, and will afford some necessary elements of any civilisation in the future. But it must undergo a transformation such as has befallen metaphysics and science; it must "contemplate moral truth as radiating from a new centre," not from the throne of God, but from the depths of tragic feeling in the human heart. Its reality must consist in this, that there are emotions which religion alone can express, as there are ideas for which we discover a medium and a sphere in music and in music alone. Religion is to be life's noblest music—only it dies away without so much as an echo in any world beyond.

We have said enough. These three remarkable men arrive at the same end by roads which are not very different. They all proclaim that Religion, as commonly understood by mankind and to some extent practised, is dying a speedy death in Protestant Germany. They all preach Atheism, Nihilism, Socialism. And they speak with the authority of that great educated multitude which the spirit of the age has made its own in thought as in conduct. Whatever may be the discrepancies and contradictions of doctrine here visible, it is still clear that the school is one, and is governed by principles which all accept. These principles we collect, and have every reason to collect, into the one plain intelligible position called Secularism. It is the belief that this world is a dream and the next a fiction. The dream we are bidden to enjoy, the fiction we are bidden to disregard. As we said at the beginning, this is the flux of Heracitus—"All things pass; let us make the most of them ere they cease to be." This, too, is the materialism of Professor Tyndall, which, with the air of a benefactor, he recommends to the most enlightened of his contemporaries and to the new generation. We should be wanting in sincerity of speech and in loyalty to the truth of God and His Church, did we hesitate to conclude with S. James that this doctrine, this philosophy, this outcome of modern science "is not wisdom descending from above, but is earthly, sensual, and devilish." This is its origin, its progress, and its end.

ART. IX.—THE FRENCH PRESIDENT AND THE NEW CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES.

Codes et Lois Usuels. Paris : Garnier. 1876.

The Federalist, on the New Constitution, written in the year 1788. By ALEXANDER HAMILTON, JAMES MADISON, and JOHN JAY. Washington : Thompson & Horns. 1831.

Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States. By JOSEPH STORY, LL.D., Dane Professor of Law in Harvard University. Boston : Hilliard, Gray, & Co. 1833.

The English Constitution. By WALTER BAGEHOT. London : Chapman & Hall. 1867.

The Treaty of Washington : its Negotiation, Execution, and the Discussions relating thereto. By CALEB CUSHING. New York : Harper. 1873.

HAVING in July anticipated a majority of at least fifty for Marshal MacMahon, in his appeal to the French constituencies, it need not be said the result of the elections is a surprise and a disappointment to us. The Opposition, though seriously damaged, will still have a considerable majority in the Chamber of Deputies. The 363 do not, according to M. Gambetta's boast, return 400. Of the 363, indeed, fifty do not return at all. But other candidates of the Left have gained seats which, according to the fairest estimate we have seen, reduce their loss as a Party to thirty-six seats. The loss of thirty-six seats to the Left means a gain of seventy-two votes to the Right on a division. This fact would alone suffice to show the growing force of the reaction against Radicalism. But the real strength of that reaction is much more decisively manifested in the record of the number of votes actually given on the one side and the other at the last and the present elections. In 1876, the number of votes for candidates of the Left was 4,316,000 and for candidates of the Right, 2,884,000—showing a majority of 1,432,000 votes for the Left. In 1877, the votes for the Left were 4,273,000, and for the Right, 3,751,000—showing a majority for the Left of 522,000 votes. In 1876, 7,200,000 electors were polled ; in 1877, 7,793,000. The vote-power of the Left, therefore, in 1876 exceeded that of the Right in a proportion equivalent to rather more than a fifth of the total number of electors polled ; while in 1877 it has fallen to almost exactly a fifteenth. Under a system of universal suffrage, votes are not to be weighed, but counted. Invited to

pay homage on this great occasion to the irresistible voice of the sovereign people, we cannot help remembering that Reaction is one of the most energetic and diffusive principles of political progress in the present age, and are obliged to calculate that at its present rate of operation the 867,000 votes added to the strength of the Right since last year may be not unreasonably expected to increase to two millions before the apparently inevitable dissolution of 1878. It is curious, too, to consider from the point of view of those who regard universal suffrage, not as the Universal Lie, as Pius the Ninth once called it, but as the *Vox populi, vox Dei*—that all the Frenchmen who voted in 1876 for and against Right and Left were not equal to the numbers who voted for the Prince President after the events of December, 1851; and that all who voted this year fall short of the number who voted for his taking the title of Emperor. Louis Napoleon received 7,439,216 votes in condonation of the *coup d'état*, and 7,864,189 for the restoration of the Empire.

Under these circumstances the question presents itself, What will the Marshal do? M. Gambetta has, in an insolent and disloyal phrase, declared that he has two alternatives, to submit or to resign. To resign is of course simply out of the question. No one who remembers the circumstances under which the supreme executive power was confided to and accepted by the Marshal in 1873, from the National Assembly in the plenitude of its sovereign authority, can imagine that he should vacate the high office which he has sworn to hold for seven years, because his ministers find difficulty in conducting the public business in the inferior branch of the Legislature. Who ever heard of the President of a Republic giving way before the jerrymandering and logrolling, the obstructiveness and caballing, which tend to make bear-gardens of the Lower Houses of almost all Constitutional States, except England and Hungary—and with which England indeed is already seriously threatened? But the peculiarity of Marshal MacMahon's position is that a degree of personal power has been, not to say confided, but forced upon him, such as, we venture to say, is without a precedent in the history of republics. In the history of Republican Governments, dictatorships, involving an almost absolute exercise of the executive power, have been not uncommon. Some of the greatest acts of American history have been done by virtue of what are called the "implied powers" of the President. American Presidents, under cover of such an authority latent in their office, becoming overt under stress of great emergencies of policy, have found themselves suddenly seized of enormous

faculties and capacities of which they had not conceived that their commission at the moment it was conferred on them contained the very germ,—as when President Jefferson suddenly purchased Louisiana from the French Government in 1803, actually doubling the extent of the territory of the Republic, without the previous consent of Congress; and as when President Lincoln was one day smitten by the brilliant idea of issuing greenbacks on his own authority, to pay the charge of the war with the South, without asking Congress for supplies;* and on another of emancipating all the negro population of the Southern States by a stroke of his pen.

Such cases, says Judge Story, in treating of the "implied" or "incidental powers of the Executive" with special reference to the annexation of Louisiana and Florida, "furnish a striking illustration of the truth that constitutions of government require a liberal construction to effect their objects, and that a narrow interpretation of their powers, however it may suit the views of speculative philosophers or the accidental interests of political parties, is incompatible with the permanent interests of the State, and subversive of the great ends of all government, the safety and independence of the people."†

* Mr. Bagehot is quite mistaken in the first sentence of the following striking passage from "The English Constitution," p. 266. Nothing was farther from the minds of the authors of the American Constitution than that Congress should be able to control the Executive. They took every sort of pains to provide otherwise. But it is more than probable they did not contemplate the possibility of a President's carrying on war by paper-money, issued without consulting Congress:—

"The authors of the Constitution doubtless intended that Congress should be able to control the American executive as our Parliament controls ours. They placed the granting of supplies in the House of Representatives exclusively. But they forgot to look after "paper money;" and now it has been held that the President has power to emit such money without consulting Congress at all. The first part of the late war was so carried on by Mr. Lincoln; he relied not on the grants of Congress, but on the prerogative of emission. It sounds a joke, but it is true nevertheless, that this power to issue greenbacks is decided to belong to the President as commander-in-chief of the army; it is part of what was called the "war power." In truth, money was wanted in the late war, and the administration got it in the readiest way; and the nation, glad not to be more taxed, wholly approved of it. But the fact remains that the President has now, by precedent and decision, a mighty power to continue a war without the consent of Congress, and perhaps against its wish. Against the united will of the American *people* a President would of course be impotent; such is the genius of the place and nation that he would never think of it. But when the nation was (as of late) divided into two parties, one cleaving to the President the other to the Congress, the now unquestionable power of the President to issue paper money may give him the power to continue the war though Parliament (as we should speak) may enjoin the war to cease."

† "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States," iii. 161.

And again, applying the same doctrine more particularly to the personal action of the President, he lays down this clear broad rule—"In the exercise of his political powers the President is to use his own discretion, and is accountable only to his country and to his own conscience. His decision in relation to those powers is subject to no control, and his discretion when exercised is conclusive" (Story, iii. 419). But the political power of Marshal MacMahon under the French Constitution, is of a far more ample and sovereign character than has ever been ascribed to the President of the United States. Chief of a provisional Republic, to which its own constitution attributes no element of duration whatsoever, and, which may, in 1880, by a mere majority of its two Chambers, resolve itself into a Constitutional Monarchy, or an Empire, or the Commune, in him alone is vested under the eighth article of the Law relative to the Organization of the Public Powers, the right of proposing, even before 1880, if he should think it advisable, a revision of the Constitution itself.* Such powers were assumed and exercised by Cromwell; but we do not remember any instance, except that of the present French Constitution, in which they were voluntarily conferred upon any Executive officer, however, trusted and eminent, by the free vote of a National Assembly. The meaning of the mandate of the National Assembly to Marshal MacMahon may, in truth, be thus simply expressed:—"If you find that this Constitution, which, we hope may, at least, give France for seven years an effective Government of transition, will not, after all, enable you, to whom we have confided the supreme power for that term, to administer affairs with Ministers whom you can trust and respect, and, according to your views of a proper policy for the State—then to you alone is reserved the power of proposing the abrogation of the whole or of any part of the Constitution that may prove obstructive or detrimental." This is not merely an immense power in itself, but it is a power in the light of which all the Marshal's ordinary powers must be construed. In him is personally vested by

* "8. Les Chambres auront le droit, par délibérations séparées, prises dans chacune à la majorité absolue des voix, soit spontanément, soit sur la demande du Président de la République, de déclarer qu'il y a lieu de réviser les lois constitutionnelles.—Après que chacune des deux Chambres aura pris cette résolution, elles se réuniront en Assemblée nationale pour procéder à la révision.—Les délibérations portant révision des lois constitutionnelles, en tout ou en partie, devront être prises à la majorité absolue des membres composant l'Assemblée nationale.—Toutefois, pendant la durée des pouvoirs conférés par la loi du 20 novembre 1873 à M. le maréchal de Mac-Mahon, cette révision ne peut avoir lieu que sur la proposition du Président de la République."

the constitution that a absolute sovereignty which the National Assembly possessed, in a way in which it cannot be by him transmitted to any successor of his in his office, should France decide that he shall have a successor with the same title at the end of his presidential term or terms. Let it be remembered, again, that time was of the essence of the pact by which the executive power was devolved upon the Marshal by the National Assembly. The number of years proper to enable the President of a Republic to feel that he is really master of his own administration, and that he may, without undue precipitation, develop the policy of whose inspirations he is the elect organ, is one of the most interesting and difficult questions in the history of democratic governments. It has been regretted by some of the wisest patriots and statesmen of the United States that the constitutional convention of 1787 did not, as it was very nearly doing at one time, settle upon seven years, instead of four, as the period of presidential power.* Only last year a proposal was made, and supported by a party in Congress considerable in numbers, and still more in authority, that an extension of the term to six years should be submitted to the people in convention. Marshal MacMahon, it was perfectly well known, would not have accepted the supreme power when it was proposed to him in May, 1873, unless he was assured that his authority should have an adequate basis in regard to its duration, to begin with; and he was strongly advised to insist upon a term of ten years. Ultimately, the septennate seems to have been decided upon as a compromise between the ten years of the French constitution of 1851, and the four years of the American constitution. The Marshal was elected, it may be added, unanimously, this condition being well known and stipulated in the law promulgated. Many abstained; only two votes were recorded against him out of 392, who voted. He was elected after want of confidence in M. Thiers had been thrice affirmed by majorities who condemned him for his even then growing tendency to lean more and more on the Radical party. Marshal MacMahon was thus elected, and he accepted office, to oppose the designs of the Radical party, as distinctly

* "Another proposition was (as has been seen) to choose the executive for seven years, which at first passed by a bare majority; but being coupled with a clause, "to be chosen by the national legislature," it was approved by the vote of eight states against two. Another clause, "to be ineligible a second time," was added by the vote of eight states against one, one being divided. In this form the clause stood in the first draft of the constitution, though some intermediate efforts were made to vary it. But it was ultimately altered upon the report of a committee, so as to change the mode of election, the term of office, and the re-eligibility, to their present form, by the vote of ten states against one" (Story, iii. 296).

as Mr. Lincoln was elected to oppose the designs of the Southern slaveholders. He is no more capable of submitting or resigning than that model of American Presidents, General Andrew Jackson, was when he once found himself in conflict, not with one merely, but with both Chambers of Congress, and resisted and defeated them both; or General George Washington before him, when the Lower House proceeded to discuss the terms of a treaty he had made, and he, on the ground that it was an act of the executive power, which was no concern of theirs, refused even to submit the papers to them. We feel assured that the Duke of Magenta will in his high office be not one whit less firm. The proud words which General MacMahon uttered, as he stood amid a hailstorm of bullets on Fort Malakoff, "*J'y suis, et j'y reste*," are the proper motto of his presidential policy at present.

If the French Republic were, like the English monarchy, merely a system of Parliamentary government, the Marshal's course would be perfectly plain. He would receive the Duc de Broglie's resignation, and send for M. Gambetta. M. Grèvy, proposing to be President in 1880, would, of course, think it beneath his dignity to take office under his predecessor. M. Gambetta, though at present smitten by two sentences of imprisonment for insulting the chief of the State, is quite as clearly designated the leader of his party as Mr. Gladstone was after the election of 1869, or Mr. Disraeli after that of 1873. M. Gambetta would accordingly, instead of going to gaol, first receive the President's pardon and then succeed the Duc de Broglie as Minister of Justice, Keeper of the Seals, and Vice-President of the Council. The portfolio of the Foreign Office would naturally be committed to M. Jules Favre, who would immediately receive the cordial congratulations of Prince Bismarck. M. Jules Simon might be entrusted with the Ministry of the Interior, if it should not be felt that the successor of M. Fourtou ought to be a man of unusual energy and resolution and in that event, the Marshal might be asked to sign, and M. Gambetta, as Minister of Justice, would, no doubt, most cheerfully countersign, an order for the release from prison of M. Bonnet Duverdier. M. Louis Blanc is obviously indicated for the post of Minister of Instruction and Public Worship. Chanzy has been rather discredited by holding the governorship of Algeria under the powers that be, and French generals, as a rule, are in favour of the principle of a standing army; but after all, Garibaldi is a French citizen, and M. Gambetta appointed him General of Division in 1870; why not make the Cincinnatus of Caprera Minister of War? With a red shirt over its red breeches, the uniform of the French army would,

at least, fulfil the ideal of Belleville. The appointment of M. Victor Hugo to the Ministry of Finance would cause a transient excitement on the Bourse; but, justified on the ground that Mr. Canning wrote verses, and nevertheless was a success as First Lord of the Treasury, that Mr. Disraeli has written novels, even after having been an excellent Chancellor of the Exchequer, it would be recognised that the time has come to give poetry and fiction their fling at the funds and taxes of France. The day may come when Mr. Whalley will sit in the seat of Mr. Cross, and Lord Kenealy on the woolsack, and when the idol of his country, now imprisoned, at the instigation of the Jesuits, in the gloomy dungeons of Dartmoor, may be summoned to that commanding position which he is so fitted to adorn in the councils of his Sovereign. Anything may happen under a system of Parliamentary Government, where the executive is a Cabinet, virtually designated by a House of Commons, to be elected by-and-bye by the agricultural labourers and trades unions of the three kingdoms. But the French Republic is not, any more than the United States, a system of Parliamentary Government, and its executive power is not lodged in a Cabinet virtually elected by the Chamber of Deputies. Its executive power is, in the words of the Constitution, "confided for seven years to Marshal MacMahon, Duke of Magenta;" and it stands to simple reason—it commends itself to common sense—that the executive power of a State, so confided to its chief, can only be exercised through Ministers of State in whom he can himself completely confide.

The French Republic is not, any more than the American Republic, according to its Constitution, a Parliamentary Government. The executive power is as strictly separated from the legislative power in the one State as it is in the other. Mr. Bagehot, in his wise and brilliant book on "*The English Constitution*," has clearly shown that the great source of energy in our Government, on the contrary, is the union of legislative and executive authority in the Cabinet, which he correctly describes as a committee virtually chosen by the majority of the House of Commons. He says:—

How important singleness and unity are in political action no one, I imagine, can doubt. We may distinguish and define its parts; but policy is a unit and a whole. It acts by laws—by administrators; it requires now one, now the other; unless it can easily move both it will be impeded soon; unless it has an absolute command of both its work will be imperfect. The interlaced character of human affairs requires a single determining energy; a distinct force for each artificial compartment will make but a motley patch-work, if it live long enough to make anything. The

excellence of the British Constitution is, that it has achieved this unity ; that in it the sovereign power is single, possible, and good. The success is primarily due to the peculiar provision of the English Constitution, which places the choice of the executive in the people's house."

The founders of the American Republic were perfectly well aware of the importance of singleness and unity in political action. But they never dreamed of the possibility of obtaining such a result by attempting to vest both legislative and executive power in a committee representing the majority of either House of Congress. On the contrary, they sought to obtain it by a strict separation of the legislative and executive powers :—

The characteristic qualities (says Chancellor Kent), required in the executive department are promptitude, decision, and force ; and those qualities are most likely to exist when the executive authority is limited to a single person, moving by the unity of a single will. Division, indecision, and delay are exceedingly unfavourable to that steady and vigorous administration of the law which is necessary to secure tranquillity at home, and command the confidence of foreign nations.

So, also, Judge Story says, when treating the very same question in his "*Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States*"—a great book, distinguished by its lofty spirit, its accurate veracity, its thorough learning, its far-reaching search of example, its serene contempt for the wild cyclones of opinion which beat about the bastions of authority in newly-formed Democratic societies, but soar away into space if they find that power rests steady on its foundations of justice and force, and is not to be shaken by mere noise :—

Taking it, then, for granted (says Judge Story) that there ought to be an executive department, the next consideration is, how it ought to be organized. It may be stated in general terms, that that organization is best, which will at once secure energy in the executive, and safety to the people. The notion, however, is not uncommon, and occasionally finds ingenious advocates, that a vigorous executive is inconsistent with the genius of a republican government. It is difficult to find any sufficient grounds on which to rest this notion ; and those, which are usually stated, belong principally to that class of minds, which readily indulge in the belief of the general perfection, as well as perfectibility, of human nature, and deem the least possible quantity of power, with which government can subsist, to be the best. To those, who look abroad into the world, and attentively read the history of other nations, ancient and modern, far different lessons are taught with a severe truth and force. Those lessons instruct them, that energy in the executive is a leading character in the definition of a good government. It is essential to the protection of the community against foreign attacks. It is not less essential to the steady administration of the laws, to the protection of property against

those irregular and high-handed combinations, which sometimes interrupt the ordinary course of justice, and to the security of liberty against the enterprises and assaults of ambition, of faction, and of anarchy. Every man the least conversant with Roman history knows, how often that republic was obliged to take refuge in the absolute power of a single man, under the formidable name of a dictator, as well against the intrigues of ambitious individuals, aspiring to tyranny, and the seditions of whole classes of the community, threatening the existence of the government, as against foreign enemies, menacing the destruction and conquest of the state. A feeble executive implies a feeble execution of the government. A feeble execution is but another phrase for a bad execution ; and a government ill executed, whatever may be its theory, must, in practice, be a bad government.

That unity is conducive to energy will scarcely be disputed. Decision, activity, secrecy, and despatch will generally characterise the proceedings of one man in a much more eminent degree, than the proceedings of a greater number ; and in proportion as the number is increased, these qualities will be diminished.

In regard to this supposed necessity of securing the unity of the executive authority by imposing the discharge of its duties upon one man, the Constitutions of the American and the French Republics run upon all fours. The terms of the Constitution of the United States were, in fact, followed by the framers of the French Constitution, and in some respects considerably strengthened. Thus the words of the American Constitution are (Art. ii., Section i., Clause i.) :—

The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years.

And the words of the first article of the French Constitution are :—

Le pouvoir exécutif est confié pour sept ans au Maréchal de Mac-Mahon, duc de Magenta, à partir de la promulgation de la présente loi ; ce pouvoir continuera à être exercé avec le titre de Président de la République et dans les conditions actuelles jusqu'aux modifications qui pourront y être apportées par les lois constitutionnelles.

General George Washington was already clearly indicated as first President of the United States, when its Constitution was adopted, but no one ever dreamed of embodying his name in that act, or of fixing him with the personal executive responsibility of the State for a term of years, or of giving to him alone, meantime, the right of advising the revision of the Constitution ; and, perhaps, the English language is incapable of conveying in a great deed of state that delicate reserve touching the duration of the Government which it professes to found, which is conveyed in the French words, "*le pouvoir continuera*

à être exercé avec le titre de Président de la République.” The French Republic is, throughout its constitutional laws, in truth, regarded as a Republic of fact, not of right—a Republic on its trial and on sufferance, Marshal MacMahon being both its chief and its judge. All the jargon of the Revolution—unity, indivisibility, eternity, liberty, equality, fraternity—is carefully avoided in its title-deeds.

The centre of gravity in the present political conditions of England is lodged in the House of Commons. It was not always so, and it may not always continue to be so. There are already signs that the influence of that House is somewhat waning, and that the powers, both of the Crown and the House of Lords, are slowly revindicating themselves. But every possible precaution was taken, openly and avowedly, by the founders of the American Republic, and in this they have been followed by the French, against allowing the House of Representatives and the Chamber of Deputies to have any such influence on Government as that of the House of Commons. We trust we may be excused for quoting again, in illustration of what we have said, several passages from the writings of Mr. Alexander Hamilton, already referred to by us in July. Speaking to this precise point, the position of the House of Commons in the English Constitution, he says:—

If a British House of Commons, from the most feeble beginnings, from the mere power of assenting or disagreeing to the imposition of a new tax, have, by rapid strides, reduced the prerogatives of the Crown, and the privileges of the nobility, within the limits they conceived to be compatible with the principles of a free Government, while they raised themselves to the rank and consequence of a co-equal branch of the legislature; if they have been able, in one instance, to abolish both the royalty and the aristocracy, and to overturn all the ancient establishments, as well in the Church as State; if they have been able, on a recent occasion, to make the monarch tremble at the prospect of an innovation* attempted by them, what would be to be feared from an elective magistrate of four years' duration, with the confined authorities of a President of the United States? What but that he might be unequal to the task which the Constitution assigns to him?†

And again, with reference to the besetting propensity of the Lower House of the legislature to encroach on the executive, he says:—

It is one thing to be subordinate to the laws, another to be dependent on the legislative body. The first comports with, the last violates, the funda-

* “This was the case with respect to Mr. Fox's India Bill, which was carried in the House of Commons, and rejected in the House of Lords, to the entire satisfaction, as it is said, of the people.”

† The Federalist, No. 71.

mental principles of good government ; and whatever may be the forms of the Constitution, unites all power in the same hands. * * * The representatives of the people, in a popular assembly, seem sometimes to fancy that they are the people themselves, and betray strong symptoms of impatience and disgust at the least sign of opposition from any other quarter ; as if the exercise of its rights, by either the executive or judiciary, were a breach of their privilege, and an outrage to their dignity. They often appear disposed to exert an imperious control over the other departments ; and, as they commonly have the people on their side, they always act with such momentum, as to make it very difficult for the other members of the Government to maintain the balance of the Constitution.*

And lastly, as to the necessity of an inflexible firmness on the part of the executive in such emergencies :—

There are some who would be inclined to regard the servile pliancy of the executive to a prevailing current, either in the community, or in the legislature, as its best recommendation. But such men entertain very crude notions, as well of the purposes for which Government was instituted, as of the true means by which the public happiness may be promoted. The Republican principle demands that the deliberate sense of the community should govern the conduct of those to whom they intrust the management of their affairs ; but it does not require an unqualified complaisance to every sudden breeze of passion, or to every transient impulse which the people may receive from the arts of men, who flatter their prejudices to betray their interests. * * * When occasions present themselves in which the interests of the people are at variance with their inclinations, it is the duty of the persons whom they have appointed, to be the guardians of those interests to withstand the temporary delusion, in order to give them time and opportunity for more cool and sedate reflection. Instances might be cited, in which a conduct of this kind has saved the people from very fatal consequences of their own mistakes, and has procured lasting monuments of their gratitude to the men who had courage and magnanimity enough to serve them at the peril of their displeasure.

But however inclined we might be to insist upon an unbounded complaisance in the executive to the inclinations of the people, we can, with no propriety, contend for a like complaisance to the humours of the legislature. The latter may sometimes stand in opposition to the former ; and at other times the people may be entirely neutral. In either supposition, it is certainly desirable that the executive should be in a situation to dare to act his own opinion with vigour and decision.†

We cite Mr. Alexander Hamilton as a Republican statesman, political philosopher, and constitutional lawyer of the very greatest eminence, a principal author of the Constitution of the United States, and admittedly the highest authority in all that concerns its interpretation, and the intentions of its

* The Federalist, No. 71.

† Ibid.

founders. He was the writer, in "The Federalist," of the papers which treat of the Executive Power. That the doctrines he laid down on this subject are accepted as the one only authentic, orthodox, and undisputed interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, concerning the relations of President and Parliament, we may be permitted to prove, by referring to the words of two American jurists, who have earned a world-wide fame, and who have both written on the organic laws of their country. Judge Story, in stating the sources of his Commentaries, places first "The Federalist, an incomparable commentary of three of the greatest statesmen of the age," and he adds this extraordinary testimony to its authority: "I have transferred into my own pages all which seemed to be of permanent importance in that great work; and have thereby endeavoured to make its merits more generally known." He has transferred, not merely by way of quotation, but has embodied in the text of his great treatise, every word that Mr. Hamilton wrote to prove that the mainspring of political action in a Republican Constitution is the President, and that the Lower House, if such a constitution is to last, must be content to occupy a very subordinate place. Chancellor Kent, an authority not less eminent and weighty, speaks in terms even more earnest of the respect due by all Republican politicians to this great book. "There is," he says, "no work on the subject of the Constitution, and on Republican and Federal Government generally, that deserves to be more thoroughly studied. No constitution of Government ever received a more masterly and successful vindication. I know not, indeed, of any work on the principles of free government that is to be compared in instruction and intrinsic value to this small and unpretending volume of 'The Federalist'; not even if we resort to Aristotle, Cicero, Machiavelli, Montesquieu, Milton, Locke, or Burke. It is equally admirable in the depth of its wisdom, the comprehensiveness of its views, the sagacity of its reflections, and the fearlessness, patriotism, candour, simplicity, and eloquence with which its truths are uttered and recommended. Mr. Justice Story acted wisely in making 'The Federalist' the basis of his 'Commentary,' and as we have had the experience of nearly fifty years since 'The Federalist' was written, the work of Judge Story is enriched with the results of that experience, and it is written in the same free and liberal spirit, with equal exactness of research and soundness of doctrine."*

We cite these eminent authorities at perhaps too great

* "Commentaries on American Law," vol. i. p. 241. By James Kent.

length, but it seems to us that it is interesting to settle at the present moment on the highest attainable authority what is the true Republican interpretation of the relations between the executive and the legislative powers in a Republican State, where, as in the United States and France, the President is the sole depository of the former power for a fixed term of years. We do not admire the French Republic as a system of Government, nor do we believe that it is destined to endure. But while it exists it is entitled to a fair trial; it is entitled, moreover, to be administered as a Republic and in a Republican spirit; and for this reason, we submit, that its statesmen should as utterly discard the Parliamentary traditions of the reigns of Louis Philippe and Queen Victoria, as the citizens of the American colonies repudiated their veneration for King, Lords, and Commons, when they founded a Presidential Government. As Mr. Bagehot pithily says, "The independence of the legislative and executive powers is the specific quality of Presidential Government, just as their fusion and combination is the precise principle of Cabinet Government." Who can deny that the great danger of France at the present moment is the attempt of the Lower Chamber of the legislature to assume the authority of an English House of Commons, and to insist on the exercise of the executive power through Ministers of its selection? What, to use Mr. Hamilton's words, would be to be feared in such a case but that the President "might be unequal to the task which the Constitution assigns to him?" Is it not true, again to cite his words, that the representatives of the people in the Chamber of Deputies "seem sometimes to fancy that they are the people themselves, and betray strong symptoms of impatience and disgust at the least sign of opposition from any other quarter, as if the exercise of its rights by the executive or the judiciary were a breach of their privilege and an outrage on their dignity?" May it not be even said that they at present "appear disposed to exercise an imperious control over the other departments"—nay, that apparently having "the people on their side" by a majority—though it be but a majority of a fifteenth of the people polled—they are acting "with such momentum as to make it very difficult for the other members of the Government to maintain the balance of the Constitution?" Is this, then, an occasion in which "the servile pliancy of the executive to a prevailing current, either in the legislature or the community," is to be regarded with favour? Is it a time for "complaisance to the humours of the legislature?" Is it not rather a time when "it is certainly desirable that the executive should be in a situation to dare to act his own

opinion with vigour and decision"—thus saving "the people from the very fatal consequences of their own mistakes," and earning "lasting monuments of their gratitude to the men who had courage and magnanimity enough to serve them at the peril of their displeasure?" As we cite and apply these passages, we cannot but feel that Mr. Hamilton's political genius had somewhat of prophetic strain in it, though such a crisis as is forecast in the words we have quoted has not, so far as we can remember, occurred in his own country. Here, perhaps, it may be said of him, as Mr. Grattan said of Mr. Burke, "prophet-like, he has pronounced the destinies of France, and in his prophetic fury admonished nations."

Thanks to the uncompromising sincerity with which the American colonists discarded their previous political belief and practice; thanks to the single-minded energy with which a series of strong-willed Presidents have continually asserted the independence, and exalted and extended the attributes, of the Executive Power, the tradition of Parliamentary Government is now dead in the United States, and not merely dead, but despised. After all, it was against the tyranny of Parliament, and especially against the unjust exercise of the peculiar power of the Commons—that of taxation—rather than against the exercise of any prerogative of the Crown, that the people of the Thirteen Colonies rebelled. Their principal enemies sat in that House. Their most powerful advocate in it, Mr. Burke, spoke in it, as they were well aware, under the prejudice attaching to the position he had recently held in their service as Agent-General for the Province of New York. To the House of Lords, on the other hand, their cause was represented with all the commanding influence of the eloquence and all the recognized majesty of the character of Lord Chatham. They retained a respect for the House of Lords which they are not ashamed to show and to prove, when opportunity offers, even to this day; but they felt such an antipathy for the House of Commons, that they were determined there should, at least, be nothing like it in their own Constitution. Mr. Hamilton says so in so many words. Accordingly, the American Constitution, by one method, as the French Constitution by another, fixes immovably the centre of gravity and regulating control of the legislative power in the Senate. This sentiment has grown with the growth and strengthened with the strength of the American Union. The large foreign population which it has, within the last half century, absorbed, has, so far from mitigating, probably intensified the feeling. The German's breast contained no chord to be touched by the name of Parliament. The Irish

peasant hated the British Constitution from top to bottom ; but having from nature and faith the instincts which attest that royalty has deep sanctions in human history, he hated the Crown less than the House of Lords ; and being, according to his own tradition of his origin, a member, however humble, of an ancient aristocratic system, he did not regard the House of Peers with quite the same detestation, distrust, and contempt as the Commons. That House in its relations with him, was a power which pressed most heavily upon him when he was weakest, and only yielded the commonest civil rights to him, inch by inch, at long intervals of time, under the terror of insurrection at home, or of foreign war, and then with mean qualifications and hypocritical pretences. A great popular chieftain, named by the people themselves, with plenty of power, was thus an institution commending itself equally to Celt and Teuton, gone across the Atlantic in search of "ready-made liberty." Nor have the American people ever regretted the vast and elastic authority, in which they commit for four years the exercise of their sovereignty to one man. On the contrary, the Presidents of whose history they are most proud, are those who exercised the Presidential power in its most absolute sense, and, when necessary, extended it ; who most strenuously resisted any attempt of Congress to control their policy ; who (and they were generally the same men) made no sparing use of their preventive check upon legislation as well ;—like Washington, who used the veto twice, against Acts of Congress ; Madison, who used it six times ; Jackson, nine times ; and, never in vain. The two methods of Government, the Parliamentary and the Presidential, were, by a curious complication of circumstances, brought into very striking contrast at the time of the discussion of the Alabama claims. Mr. Caleb Cushing was then counsel for the United States. He is a lawyer of much eminence, particularly versed in constitutional and international law, who, on this great occasion, represented his Government with the full approval of the American Bar and people. His words, which we are about to cite, at all events prove that Mr. Hamilton's doctrine is still heartily held by those who may be fairly regarded as his disciples and successors, and that the experience of three generations of American statesmen and jurists confirms his doctrine, that Parliamentary Government is incompatible with the due distribution of powers in a Republican Constitution. It should be mentioned that the italics in the following passage are Mr. Cushing's own :—

Now, the submergence of the power of the Crown in Parliament, and of that of Parliament in the House of Commons, and the commitment of all

these powers to transitory nominees of the House of Commons, are facts which, combined, have produced the result that *government* in England is at the mercy of every gust of popular passion, every storm of misdirected public opinion, every devious impulse of demagogic agitation—nothing correspondent to which exists in the United States.

Mr. Gladstone is Prime Minister of Great Britain—that is to say, of three hundred millions of men, aggregated into various States of Europe, Africa, America, Asia, and Australasia. But he holds all this power at the mere will of a majority of the House of Commons. He must consult their wishes and their prejudices in every act of his political life. If he conceives a great idea, he cannot make anything of it until after he shall have driven it into the heads of three or four hundred country gentlemen, which are not always easily *perforable* either by eloquence or by reason. And during the progress of all great measures, including especially foreign negotiations, which require to be undisturbed in their progress from germination to maturity, he is subject to be goaded almost to madness every day by vicious interpellations, not only on the part of members of the opposition, but even his own supporters in the House of Commons.

How different is the spectacle of government in the United States! Here, the President—that is, the Prime Minister of the sovereign people—is placed in power for a fixed period of time, during which he is politically independent of faction, and can look at the temporary passions of the hour with calmness, so as to judge them at their true value, and accept or reject their voice according to the dictates of public duty and the command of his conscience. Neither he nor any of the members of his cabinet are subject to be badgered by factious or unreasonable personal interrogation in either house of Congress.

Moreover, the House of Representatives does not presume to set itself up as the superior either of the President or of the Senate. Nor is the Senate in the condition of being terrified from the discharge of its duty by threats on the part of the President or of the House of Representatives to subjugate its free will at any moment by thrusting into it a batch of twenty new administration Senators. Least of all does the House of Representatives presume to possess and exercise the powers of a constituent national convention, to change in its discretion the constitution of the United States.

Thus it was that, in the matter of the discussion of this Treaty, Mr. Gladstone and the other ministers were tossed to and fro on the surging waves of public opinion, and pestered from day to day in Parliament, while solicitously engaged in reflecting how best to keep faith with the United States, and at the same time do no prejudice to Great Britain. If, at that period, the ministers said in debate anything unwise, anything not strictly true or just—Mr. Gladstone did, but Lord Granville did not—let it not be remembered against them personally, but charged to the uncontrollable difficulties of their position, and the signal defectiveness and intrinsic weakness of the organic institutions of Great Britain.

During all that period of earnest discussion on both sides of the ocean, it was to me, as an American, matter of the highest thankfulness and gratula-

tion and patriotic pride, to see the government of the United States—President, Secretary of State, Cabinet, Congress—continue in the even tenor of their public duty, calm, unruffled, self-possessed, as the stars in heaven. The Executive of the United States is, it is true, by its very nature, a thoughtful and self-contained power. Congress, on the other hand, is the field of debate and the place where popular passions come into evidence, as the winds in the cave of Æolus. But, on this occasion, no more debate occurred in either House than that least possible expression of opinion, which was necessary to show accord with the Executive. Even the opposition, to its honour be it said, conducted itself with commendable reserve and consideration. How different from all this was the spectacle exhibited by the British Parliament ! *

The American Constitution in one way, the French in another, provides that, of the two Chambers, the higher authority shall always belong to the Senate. Mr. Madison discussed this subject with particular ability and learning in "The Federalist." He lays it down, as the result of his considerable study of the Republican form of Government, that "history informs us of no long-lived Republic which had not a Senate." He adds : —

To a people as little blinded by prejudice, or corrupted by flattery, as those whom I address, I shall not scruple to add, that such an institution may be sometimes necessary, as a defence to the people against their own temporary errors and delusions. As the cool and deliberate sense of the community ought, in all governments, and actually will, in all free governments, ultimately prevail over the views of its rulers : so there are particular moments in public affairs, when the people, stimulated by some irregular passion, or some illicit advantage, or misled by the artful misrepresentations of interested men, may call for measures which they themselves will afterwards be the most ready to lament and condemn. In these critical moments, how salutary will be the interference of some temperate and respectable body of citizens, in order to check the misguided career, and to suspend the blow meditated by the people against themselves, until reason, justice, and truth, can regain their authority over the public mind ? What bitter anguish would not the people of Athens have often escaped, if their government had contained so provident a safeguard against the tyranny of their own passions ? Popular liberty might then have escaped the indelible reproach of decreeing to the same citizens, the hemlock on one day, and statues on the next.†

The French people have now and then had occasion to feel in the course of their history, as Mr. Madison supposes the Athenians to have felt. Evidently, if the Senate is to exercise the influence expected from it it must have powers greatly superior to those of the other branch of the Legislature. The founders of the Constitution of the United States hoped

* Treaty of Washington, p. 45.

† The Federalist, No. 63.

that by means of a strong Executive and a strong Senate, mutually sustaining each other, and having certain constitutional functions in common, the Lower House might be kept in that modest, though far from unimportant, place in the political system which the name, by which it is more commonly known, indicates. Accordingly, it was determined that certain of the powers of the Executive should be exercised with the concurrence of the Senate, and the most important of the powers of the House of Representatives under the control of the Senate. The great functionaries of State, the Judges of the Supreme Court, his own Ministers and Envoys are appointed by the American President; but they must be approved by the Senate. Treaties with Foreign Powers are not binding unless approved by the Senate; then they become law. The American President has no occasion to concern himself to consider whether the House of Representatives approves of the persons composing his Cabinet, or of those who represent the nation in its great foreign legations. Their right even to discuss the terms of a treaty is somewhat doubtful; and, at all events, beyond mere discussion, they have no power. In such grave affairs, neither President nor Minister heeds their adverse votes. To impeach either would be to impeach the Senate itself. Again, Money Bills must come from the Lower House; but the Constitution of the United States was careful that in this most important attribute of power the Senate should not confound its position with that of the House of Lords. The Senate exercises the same control over finance as over all other business; and, in the words of the Constitution, its members "propose or concur with amendments, as on other bills." We are glad to see that the French Senate, justly regarding this as one of what the Americans would call its "implied powers," has insisted on its right of amending Money Bills, notwithstanding the absence of any special clause in the constitution on the subject. The French constitution was very vaguely—we must not hesitate to say, in some respects, even very loosely drawn; and, but for the fact that it is modelled in its general distribution of powers, and in the demarcation of estate from estate on the constitution of the United States, there might be a very great difficulty in finding an authoritative canon of interpretation for its text. It is certain that no such canon is to be found in the entirely new theory of the functions of constitutional sovereignty which has attained acceptance in England since the premiership of Lord Melbourne. It is certain, on the contrary, that the power of the French President is a far less limited, far more arbitrary, not to say absolute, power than that of the President of the

United States. The French President appoints everybody to everything—minister, ambassador, bishop, general, prefect, mayor, as well as the policeman, the postman, the exciseman, the tide-waiter—in which latter categories only is the patronage of the American President virtually uncontrolled. He is not obliged to consult the Senate as to the construction of his Cabinet, or the choice of his diplomatists. His power of concluding treaties is, in some respects, greater than that of the American President. He concludes and ratifies treaties in general of his own authority, and communicates them to the Chambers only when, in his opinion, the interest and safety of the State so permit; but in regard to commercial treaties, or cession or acquisition of territory, his power is limited; so that if, in the stress of some great crisis of a general war, an opportunity were to offer itself of reacquiring Alsace and Lorraine by purchase, such as President Jefferson availed himself of when he annexed Louisiana, the Marshal would be obliged to wait until the two Chambers had first agreed to a law on the subject.

With the exception of some such curious and rather absurd limitations, the powers of the French President are distinctly greater than those of the American President. Above all, he possesses the power of adjourning both Houses twice within the session, and of dissolving the Chamber of Deputies, with the concurrence of the Senate. The American President cannot interfere with the session of Congress unless the Houses themselves disagree on the proper term for their adjournment. He has no power of dissolving the Lower House. The powers which the American Constitution confer on the Senate, while they greatly augment its dignity and influence, are still powers which undoubtedly tend to limit the authority of the Executive; and if the Senate had not habitually realized the duty imposed upon it by the Constitution of sustaining the power of the President, the Constitution, so variously tried in other ways, could not have survived to ninety years of age. But the power given by the French Constitution to the French Senate of deciding with the President when it may be necessary to dissolve the representatives of the Commons is a power far beyond that of objecting to the nomination of an occasional Minister or Judge of Appeal. The House which possesses such a power is, in fact as in law, the superior branch of the legislature. If the House of Lords were suddenly given the right to advise the Crown to dissolve, and to alter Money Bills, the whole balance of the British Constitution would be altered. The power of the House of Commons, as we know it, would speedily eva-

porate. But such a power, however desirable, as that of the House of Commons, in such a monarchy as England, is not regarded as by any means desirable, or even possible, in a Republic. The authors of the French Constitution, therefore, gave, in our opinion, a far more useful and direct authority to their Senate than that which the American Senate holds. As the actual and the implied powers of the French Constitution are more and more exercised and evolved, it will be found, should the Republic last, that the Senate will become, as the American Senate has become, in ability and character immeasurably the more powerful and important branch of the legislature; and the Chamber of Deputies, after several severe struggles, perhaps, to assume powers and assert an equality which it no longer possesses by law—struggles which can only have a painful end—will devote itself to the humble, but not the less useful rôle which belongs to it according to the Constitution.

The American legislators of the last century (says Mr. Bagehot) have been much blamed for not permitting the ministers of the President to be members of the Assembly; but, with reference to the specific end which they had in view, they saw clearly and decided wisely. They wished to keep 'the legislative branch absolutely distinct from the executive branch;' they believed such a separation to be essential to a good constitution; they believed such a separation to exist in the English, which the wisest of them thought the best constitution. And, to the effectual maintenance of such a separation, the exclusion of the President's ministers from the legislature is essential. If they are not excluded they become the executive, they eclipse the President himself. A legislative chamber is greedy and covetous; it acquires as much, it concedes as little as possible. The passions of its members are its rulers; the law-making faculty, the most comprehensive of the imperial faculties is its instrument; it will *take* the administration if it can take it. Tried by their own aims, the founders of the United States were wise in excluding the ministers from Congress (p. 30).

Mr. Bagehot was not literally correct in the leading statement of this paragraph, which in other respects, we submit, sustains our general argument. An able American critic of his work, Mr. Bradford, in the *North American Review*, of January, 1874, traversed that statement in these terms:—"The founders of the United States did not exclude the Ministers from Congress. The Constitution is absolutely silent on the subject." As a matter of historical fact, however, Mr. Bagehot was undoubtedly right. It was evidently found very soon in the actual working of the United States Constitution, that the distinction between the Executive Power and the Legislative could only be maintained by regarding the Ministers simply as officers of the Executive Department, and

by their protecting themselves from the interference of the Legislature through the very simple process of omitting to seek seats on its benches. This state of things came to pass—it was not proposed; but it was quite in accordance with the line of reasoning so clearly and conclusively stated by Mr. Bagehot. All the American statesmen, who really made their Constitution a subject of study, shared the same dread. "The Executive in our Government," said Mr. Jefferson, a politician of a very different character from Mr. Hamilton, "is not the sole, it is scarcely the principal, object of my jealousy. The tyranny of the legislatures is the most formidable dread at present, and will be for many years." If we may trust Mr. Cushing's testimony, the problem is now solved in the United States. We trust, and we believe, that it is; and that the stability of the Republic is assured thereby. We are far from feeling the same confidence with regard to the Constitution of France. It is much to be desired that some eminent French lawyer and statesman would take the six organic laws of 1875, and unfold their provisions and powers, expressed, implied, and incidental, with the same accuracy, lucidity, and energy as characterise the wonderful work of Hamilton, Madison, and Jay. It is easy to see that the most difficult part of his task would be to ascertain the exact sense of the various clauses of the Constitution in which the responsibility of the Ministers before the Chambers is, we will not say, defined but expressed. According to the law of the 10th of July, 1875,* it would seem to have been contemplated that the Ministers need not necessarily be Members of either Chamber, for it provides for their having access to both, and being heard, if they so demand, or having commissioners named by them heard, in defence of any legislative measure under discussion. In the same clause, it is indicated that the constitutional course of communication between the Executive and the Legislature is, as in America, a message from the President, read by a Minister. So that this clause, if it stood alone, might be interpreted as meaning that Ministers have the right personally or by their delegates to assist the deliberations of the Legislature by the communication of necessary information to enlighten it in the discharge of its legislative functions, but need not be either Senators or Deputies. But

* "Le Président de la République communique avec les Chambres par des messages qui sont lus à la tribune par un ministre. Les ministres ont leur entrée dans les deux Chambres et doivent être entendus quand ils le demandent. Ils peuvent se faire assister par des commissaires désignés, pour la discussion d'un projet de loi déterminé, par décret du Président de la République."

in the sixth clause of a previous law, that of the 25th of February,* it is said that the Ministers are jointly responsible before the Chambers for the general policy of the Government, and individually for their personal acts. These terms are very large and very general. They seem to include everything, and yet, strictly construed, they amount to nothing, except that Ministers are liable to be impeached for general or individual misconduct in office, as the President is for High Treason alone. The earlier law must, of course, be read as corrected and qualified by the later; and the later law, certainly, does not convey that view of the constant intimate association of Ministers with, and their absolute dependence upon a majority in, the legislature, which we are accustomed to connect with the idea of Parliamentary Government. A Minister of State is in the first instance an executive officer. To whom is he responsible in that capacity? Plainly to the person charged by the Constitution with the executive power. The legislature has no control over the executive power; its domain is the law. It has undoubtedly the power to bring ministers to justice, if their general or particular policy in any way contravenes the law; but we do not see how it can compel the person to whom the executive power is alone confided to exercise his executive functions through ministers in whom he cannot himself confide, but who may happen to have the confidence of the legislative power. This cannot possibly have been contemplated. It would mean the subjection of the superior to the inferior power—the first object of the Constitution being obviously and notoriously to mark their independence of each other. And in truth Marshal MacMahon, though he has endeavoured as far as he possibly could to find ministers in whom he could confide, and who should also be acceptable to the Chambers, has never admitted their right to turn his ministers out of office. He has always refused to allow any change to be made in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of War. It is our belief that in the present state of France much more injury can be done to the moral and effective power of the nation by a Radical Minister of the Interior, or of Justice, or of Public Instruction, than can be redressed by the most brilliant administration of Foreign Affairs or the most effective reorganization of the army. In those successive attempts,—the Dufaure ministry, the Simon ministry,—the time for compromise and

* "Les ministres sont solidairement responsables devant les Chambres de la politique générale du Gouvernement, et individuellement de leurs actes personnels. Le Président de la République n'est responsable que dans le cas de haute trahison."

conciliation passed, not through the Marshal's fault, in vain. The time has now come for him, in President Abraham Lincoln's homely phrase, "to put his foot down," and prepare for the evidently necessary revision of the Constitution; meantime to maintain in office and uphold with all the personal power which the Constitution has conferred upon him, with, as we also hope, the support of the Senate, the Ministry of the Duc de Broglie. For in him we honour the statesman to whom is due the glory of having given to France the secure (if temporary) haven of its present government; who pre-eminently possesses the confidence of its chief and of the best and wisest of his countrymen; and who is slowly and surely earning that honour from history of which the general and phrenetic hatred of the demagogy of the day is the certain and gratifying presage. No man in the world, we trust and believe, has a keener relish for what a French writer once, speaking of him, charmingly called *les joies amères d'impopularité*; and he needs it.

Our argument is, that a Republican constitution should, while it lasts, be interpreted and applied in a Republican spirit. We have cited Republican authorities to sustain this argument; but so far as the opinion of this country is concerned, we are perfectly well aware that argument and authority are alike in vain. There is a frantic desire in the breast of the modern Liberal—and on this subject opinion at large is bitten with Liberalism—to see the French Revolution carried *jusqu'au bout*,—through no matter what "varieties of untried being," as Mr. Burke said,—no matter what series of "leaps in the dark"; even unto (as Mr. Carlyle in an idiotic moment once expressed it) "the burning up with unquenchable fire of all the Gigs that are in the earth." The terrible past and recent agonies of France, the words of its best and wisest, avail not, any more than the cries of animals to their vivisectors. But the margin of its coin avers, and history attests, that God protects France. His Vicar's recent words have not been all in vain. They have moved and are moving the minds of masses of men; and, critical as is the emergency, it is not beyond the control of the Presidential Power, if used with that high hand, that thorough and steadfast spirit, which we have as good a right to expect from Marshal MacMahon as from General Jackson or General Washington.

Notices of Books.

The Via Media of the Anglican Church. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.
Vol. 1st. London : Pickering.

MANY years ago, when Mr. Newman's intention of submitting to the Church became generally known, it was a common exclamation of Anglicans, that he might personally indeed go to Rome, but that he would never be able to answer his own anti-Roman arguments. These critics, however, had not very long to wait; for almost simultaneously with his conversion there appeared his *Essay on Development*. In this *Essay* not only he replied triumphantly to what had been by far his own strongest point, but entirely turned the tables on his opponents, by showing that it was they, and not Roman Catholics, who were in overt and flagrant contradiction to Church history.

So much in regard to what was by far F. Newman's strongest anti-Roman argument, his allegation of Rome's supposed unfaithfulness to the primitive Deposit. But he had also insisted strongly on another objection: an objection far inferior in plausibility to the former, yet not without some superficial appearance of force. This objection is based on "the difference which at first sight presents itself between the formal teaching" of Catholicity "and its popular and political manifestations" (p. xxxvii.).

We have said that this objection is a far less plausible one than the former. In his Protestant work, it was mainly the Church's *definitions* which Mr. Newman regarded as her "formal teaching." But, even as regards the Church's mere office of teaching the Faith,—how was it even a plausible statement, that the Church's definitions necessarily contain either the whole or even the most important part of her doctrine? Protestants often argue, as though the Church's definitions claimed to be a methodical exhibition of her teaching. But such a notion is refuted on the very surface of ecclesiastical history. As F. Newman now points out (p. 223, note), "doctrines remain implicit" and so undefined, "*until they are contravened.*" That portion then of Catholic dogma, and that alone, is commonly defined, which *has been contravened*. But is it the most vital and essential parts of her doctrine, which are sure to be those earliest contravened? Rather the contrary. For instance, what could possibly from the first have been more momentous and fundamental, than the revealed doctrine on Justification? Yet it was not defined before the Sixteenth Century, when men arose wicked enough to deny it. The infallibility again of the *Ecclesia Docens*—the ruling and supreme principle of Catholic theology—was not defined,

until (less than ten years ago) it became incidentally necessary to do so, in order to define the Supreme Pontiff's infallible magisterium. In like manner (as we have more than once pointed out) there are various doctrines concerning the Blessed Virgin, involved e.g. in indulgenced prayers, which are infallibly true, though there has never happened to arise any necessity for defining them.* And something of the same kind may be said, in regard to the Church's doctrine on Purgatory and again on Eternal Punishment.

Even then as regards the Church's mere *teaching*, there is not so much as any plausibility in the supposition, that her definitions at any given period sufficiently represent even the most important and vital parts of that teaching. But secondly, Mr. Newman forgot (as F. Newman now points out) that the Church has other offices besides that of teaching; and that definitions do not purport to lay down, in any degree, either the legitimate forms of popular devotion, or the Church's every-day maxims of practical and political action. To say that the Church is insincere and double-dealing, because no one could guess from her doctrinal definitions what are her popular devotions and what her maxims of government—is like saying that some military commander is insincere and double-dealing, because no one could guess, from his official despatches, how his soldiers amuse themselves in winter quarters. The topic here indicated is that mainly treated by F. Newman in the freshly-added portion of the present volume. The Anglican Essay, which he has here republished, contained the most express and carefully-elaborated assault on Rome, which Mr. Newman ever put forth. In republishing it, F. Newman deals with various incidental details by bracketted notes *ad locum*. But there were two pervasive anti-Roman objections, which did not admit of being thus dealt with. The first of these—Rome's alleged unfaithfulness to the Primitive Deposit—he had already encountered (as we just now observed) in the Essay on Development. The second—the allegation that Rome's practical spirit differs startlingly from her formal teaching—is made the subject of a prefatory Essay to the present volume; and we will here briefly indicate its argument. In order then to bring out clearly the force of his reply, he is led to inquire what is the Church's full work. Is it only to teach religious truth? On the contrary this is but a comparatively small part of her office.

"It is her special duty, as a sovereign State, to consolidate her several portions, to enlarge her territory, to keep up and to increase her various populations in this ever-dying, ever-nascent world, in which to be stationary is to lose ground, and to repose is to fail. It is her duty to strengthen and facilitate the intercourse of city with city, and race with race, so that an injury done to one is felt to be an injury to all, and the act of individuals has the energy and momentum of the whole body. It is her duty to have her eyes upon the movements of all classes in her wide dominion, on ecclesiastics and laymen, on the regular clergy and secular, on civil society, and political movements. She must be on the watch-tower, discerning in the distance and providing against all dangers; she

* F. Newman accounts the Church infallible in her adoption of devotions, "so far as they imply doctrine" (p. lxxv.).

has to protect the ignorant and weak, to remove scandals, to see to the education of the young, to administer temporalities, to initiate, or at least, to direct all Christian work, and all with a view to the life, health, and strength of Christianity, and the salvation of souls" (pp. lxxx. lxxxi.).

In the fulfilment of this multifarious work, she does not receive a simple gift of infallibility, as in her direct doctrinal teaching: yet, by giving her the latter infallibility, God "indirectly protects her from serious errors in worship and political action also." (pp. xlii., iii.). For instance (p. lxxxiv.), the Pope's infallibility must certainly extend to her canonization of Saints; because the Church "cannot be permitted by God to be led into error on a point of morals by the Supreme Pontiff." And so in a large multitude of similar cases. Still this divine supervision—inescapable as is its value—

"does not secure her from all dangers as regards the problem which she has to solve. Nothing but the gift of impeccability granted to her authorities would secure them from all liability to mistake in their conduct, policy, words and decisions, in her legislative and her executive, in ecclesiastical and disciplinarian details; and such a gift they have not received. In consequence, however well she may perform her duties on the whole, it will always be easy for her enemies to make a case against her, well founded or not, from the action or interaction, or the chronic collisions or contrasts, or the temporary suspense or delay, of her administration, in her three several departments of duty—her government, her devotions, and her schools—from the conduct of her rulers, her pastors, her divines or her people.

"It is this difficulty lying in the nature of the case, which supplies the staple of those energetic charges and vivid pictures of the inconsistency, double-dealing, and deceit of the Church of Rome, as found in Protestant writings, and in particular in the Lectures and other publications here immediately under consideration" (p. xliii.).

In various portions of his Preface, F. Newman applies this masterly general view to an indefinite number of individual particulars. We cannot give more than a specimen of these applications; but there are one or two which certainly claim to be placed before our readers. And chiefly of all, as to the general charge of practical idolatrousness and superstition, which non-Catholic writers—Mr. Newman inclusively—have ever brought against the Catholic Church. Take one instance, which may represent millions. "A poor Neapolitan crone, who chatters to the crucifix, refers that crucifix in her deep mental consciousness to an Original, who once hung upon a cross in flesh and blood; but is nevertheless puzzle-headed enough to assign virtue to it in itself" (p. lxviii.). Church authorities, forsooth, are chargeable with misprision of heresy, because they rejoice unspeakably in her love of her Saviour, and make no account whatever of what the Protestant calls her "superstition." Why, on such a principle, no one who does not possess sustained logical habits—that is, only an infinitesimal fragment of mankind—can rightly indulge in warm and tender emotion at all towards the image of the crucified Saviour.* The

* We have perhaps even understated our case. Suppose the most logical man alive to have been a tenderly affectionate son, and to be now con-

Church's "formal teaching" then is practically inoperative, unless it be supplemented by a large and rich practical development. In the great majority of cases, we verily believe, those who protest against "superstitions" of this particular kind,* really detest a fundamental principle of religion; they detest the principle, that the heart's warmest and tenderest emotions should be lavished on the great Objects of faith.

On this head F. Newman makes one of those brilliant and suggestive remarks, which are so characteristic of his writings. "In His new Law," he says, Christ "was opening the meaning of the word 'idolatry,' and applying it to various sins; the adoration paid to rich men, the thirst after gain, ambition, and the pride of life: idolatries worse in His judgment than the idolatry of ignorance, but not commonly startling or shocking to educated minds" (p. lxviii.). The argument here implied might be wrought out into a long essay, and bears thinking of again and again. Take some respectable Catholic, regular in his religious duties, and most careful to guard against mortal sin, who is still in greater or less degree a slave to worldliness. He holds with the firmness of faith, that one additional grade of sanctifying grace is indefinitely more precious than any temporal advantage. Yet let us enter into his mind, while he is projecting plans for his daughter's marriage or his son's advancement in life. We shall find there a whole continuous stream of thoughts, which are directly contradictory to the great principle of faith held by him speculatively and abstractedly: thoughts which, if taken by themselves and put down in black and white, are directly heretical. In fact, the Neapolitan crone, whom he probably despises for her "superstition," is far more conformed to the Gospel standard in her habitual judgments than he is himself.

F. Newman justly lays very great stress on the history, related by three different evangelists, of the woman who touched the hem of our Lord's garment. With *her* faith there was mixed real superstition—which we cannot admit concerning the "Neapolitan crone"—because she deliberately expected that "virtue" might "go out" of our Lord without His knowing it. Yet He said to her that it was *her* faith itself—alloyed though it were by superstition—which had made her whole. And then F. Newman thus proceeds:—

"Men talk of our double aspect now; has not the first age a double aspect? Do not such incidents in the Gospel as this, and the miracle on the swine, the pool of Bethesda, the restoration of the servant's ear, the changing water into wine, the coin in the fish's mouth, and the like, form an aspect of Apostolic Christianity very different from that presented by St. Paul's Pastoral Epistles and the Epistle General of St. John? Need men wait for the Mediæval Church in order to make their complaint that the theology of Christianity [is by no means coextensive with] its religious manifestations?"† (p. lxvii.).

templating with many tears the picture of his deceased mother. Will his logic really save him from frequently imagining that the beloved object is herself before his eyes? We do not think so badly of logic.

* We say "of this particular kind." Of course there *are* superstitions, against which the Church is bound earnestly to warn her children.

† F. Newman's words are "*does not accord with its religious manifestations.*" But this expression might be understood to mean, that there is

F. Newman sums up his treatment of the subject in a very vigorous and noteworthy comment :-

"And may I not add that this aspect of our Lord's teaching is quite in keeping with the general drift of His discourses? Again and again He insists on the necessity of faith; but where does He insist on the danger of superstition, an infirmity, which, taking human nature as it is, is the sure companion of faith, when vivid and earnest? Taking human nature as it is, we may surely concede a little superstition, as not the worst of evils, if it be the price of making sure of faith. Of course it need not be the price, and the Church, in her teaching function, will ever be vigilant against the inroad of what is a degradation both of faith and reason: but considering, as Anglicans will allow, how intimately the sacramental system is connected with Christianity, and how feeble and confused is at present the ethical intelligence of the world at large, it is a distant day, at which the Church will find it easy, in her oversight of her populations, to make her Sacerdotal office keep step with her Prophetic. Just now I should be disposed to doubt whether that nation really had the Faith, which is free in all its ranks and classes from all kinds and degrees of what is commonly considered superstition" (pp. lxviii., lxix.).

Closely connected with this question of "superstition," is that which concerns the Catholic cultus of Saints; and F. Newman treats this with characteristic power from p. lxix. to p. lxxiv. It is of momentous importance towards the acquisition of a truly unworldly and mortified spirit, that Christians be carefully trained to vent their religious emotions, not on the Infinite only, but also on finite objects of veneration and supplication. Moreover this belief in finite objects of worship (as F. Newman points out) is most congenial to the human mind; and "polytheism" itself is but "a natural sentiment corrupted" (p. lxxi.).

Another point, to which F. Newman has adverted, has a special interest for ourselves; because during many years we have been in one shape or other dwelling on it. He points out, that the very issuing of an infallible definition often largely depends on questions of expediency. There are of course obvious limits to this statement. Let it be supposed e.g. that some tenet springs up within the Church of such a character, that the mass of Catholics at once recognize it as contradictory to what they have been always taught as a dogma of the Catholic Faith. It becomes the Pope's peremptory and indispensable duty to condemn such a tenet *ex cathedra*; and Honorius was anathematized for no other reason, than his having violated that duty. In all these cases the defined dogma had been in its essence *de fide Catholicâ*, even before its definition. But many defined dogmata are differently circumstanced: e.g. the Immaculate Conception, or Papal Infallibility, or certain truths declared at Orange against the Semi-Pelagians. And very many other doctrines are from time to time infallibly defined, which are not dogmata of the Faith at all, though intimately bound up with the Faith and necessary to its secure protection. As

some *inconsistency* between its theology and its religious manifestations: which of course F. Newman does not for a moment admit. In one or two other passages we have observed a similar ambiguity of expression, which might possibly perhaps engender grave misconception.

regards each of these two latter classes, questions of expediency have largely to be considered by the Pope antecedently to his definition : because Popes are not *teachers* only of Christendom, but also its "head rulers ; and their first duty as such" is "that of securing its peace, union, and consolidation" (p. lxxxii.-iii.). What then is to be done on those occasions, not very unfrequent, "when either a schism is to be encountered or an opportune truth left undecided"? (p. xlii.). No *general* answer can be given, we suppose, to this question, beyond the obvious remark, that whenever the Pope *does* define, assuredly and infallibly his definition is beneficial to the Church and not the reverse.

Another matter treated by F. Newman, on which we have before now more than once written, is the case of Galileo. In pp. lv., lvi., F. Newman admirably explains "the disorder and dismay" which that astronomer's hypothesis must have spread among good Catholics. And F. Newman seems to hold, as we hold ourselves, that even had Galileo's theory been scientifically verified, the Pope might laudably have for a time prohibited its promulgation.*

In treating Galileo's case, F. Newman makes an incidental remark which is both true and important ; viz., that "a proposition may be ever so true, yet at a particular time and place may be 'temerarious,' 'offensive to pious ears' and 'scandalous'" (p. lvi.). There is an entirely different question however, which F. Newman does not consider ; viz., whether a true proposition can possibly be *condemned ex cathedrâ*, as temerarious, offensive to pious ears, and scandalous. We believe the great majority of theologians answer this question in the negative ; because they consider an *ex cathedrâ* censure to imply, that the propositions are *in themselves* deserving of the censure pronounced, and not merely "at a particular time and place." (See Murray de Ecclesiâ, dis. xvii., n. 31.)

Space obliges us here to desist from further examples of F. Newman's argument. We admit that occasionally we find incidental statements, with which we cannot concur ; and there is one passage of which we confess ourselves unable to conjecture the sense. The passage is so remarkable, that we feel bound to place it before our readers, in the hope that more competent judges may pronounce both on its meaning and on its truth.

"It is so ordered on high" [says F. Newman] "that in our day Holy Church should present just that aspect to my countrymen, which is most consonant with their ingrained prejudices against her, most unpromising for their conversion ; and what can one writer do to counteract this misfortune?" (p. xxxvii.).

On the whole, however, we heartily admire this most interesting and powerful Preface. We may doubt indeed, whether the particular objection, to which F. Newman therein replies, either possesses so much apparent argumentative force or exercises so much practical influence

* We have more than once pointed out that, instead of being scientifically verified, Galileo's alleged discovery was hardly more than what is vulgarly called a "fluke."

as he supposes. But it has given him the occasion of setting forth, with characteristic power and eloquence, a number of profoundly important Catholic truths.

The Life and Times of Thomas Becket. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE. Parts I. to IV. (*The Nineteenth Century*, June to September, 1877.)
The Murder of Thomas Becket. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE. (*The Nineteenth Century*, October, 1877.)

ON November 16th, 1538, after the formality of a posthumous trial at Westminster, King Henry VIII. issued a proclamation stating that "Forasmuch as it now clearly appeared that Thomas Becket had been killed in a riot excited by his own obstinacy and intemperate language, and had afterwards been canonized by the Bishop of Rome as the champion of his usurped authority, the king's majesty thought it expedient to declare to his loving subjects that he was no saint, but rather a rebel and traitor to his prince; and therefore strictly charged and commanded that he should not be esteemed or called a saint, that all images and pictures of him should be destroyed, the festivals in his honour be abolished, and his name and remembrance be erased out of all books, under pain of his majesty's indignation and imprisonment at his grace's pleasure."* Mr. James Anthony Froude might very well have made this proclamation the text or key-note of his five articles in the *Nineteenth Century*. The thesis he maintains is identical with that set forth by Henry VIII. in his proclamation against the memory of S. Thomas of Canterbury.

Those who have read Mr. Froude's strange narrative of the history of England under Henry VIII. and his three children will not be surprised to find that, in treating of the struggle between S. Thomas and Henry II., he has set himself to vilify the archbishop and justify the king at any cost. A more thoroughly prejudiced "historical" essay we have seldom if ever seen. It professes to be founded on the valuable "Materials for the History of Archbishop Thomas Becket"† published by the Master of the Rolls as one of the Record Office Series. It is really based upon Mr. Froude's own preconceived notions of the times of S. Thomas, of the man's character, and of the principles for which he contended. Given as the subject an historical character whose career was a stormy one, and whose name has become the watchword of a cause; given as the writer an "historian" who invariably writes with much greater attention to the moral he intends to point than to the facts he details, and who is noted for his prejudices both in the sphere of religion and of politics; and given as this writer's method the collection of all that will tell against the man of whom he writes, whether it be the admissions of friends or the invectives

* Lingard, v. 110, edition of 1849.

† "Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury" (canonized by Pope Alexander III. A.D. 1173), edited by James Craigie Robertson, M.A., Canon of Canterbury. Published under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. 2 vols. London: 1875-76.

of enemies, and the disregard of nearly all that will tell in the opposite direction, and the result will certainly be something very like these articles on "Thomas Becket." This may be very clever, but it is not history, and no parade of historical impartiality and scientific method will make it history.

We cannot here criticise Mr. Froude in detail. To reply fully to these five articles would require at least a long article in our pages, and it is very doubtful whether Mr. Froude's attack deserves so elaborate an answer. We shall therefore content ourselves with pointing out some of the fallacies and misstatements which to our mind make it quite worthless as an historical study. Mr. Froude begins by making an attempt to excite prejudice against the Church and Churchmen generally of the twelfth century, in order that some part of this prejudice may attach to Becket, and the name of a reformer of discipline and morals may be claimed for Henry as opposed to the Church. There were doubtless many evils and many abuses in the twelfth century, for it was a period when the German emperors were striving to force unfit men into the supreme government of the Church by setting up antipopes, and when lesser sovereigns were imitating them by compelling the chapters to accept at their hands worldly-minded bishops, and knights and nobles again followed their kings by thrusting their dissolute dependents into benefices. The satire and the remonstrance of Nigellus, on which Mr. Froude mainly relies for evidence, is a protest against this state of things, i.e. against lay interference and state interference with the Church, which was the real source of these evils. It was precisely against this that S. Thomas fought, and it is remarkable that among the worldly-minded prelates denounced by Nigellus as having been improperly thrust into a see, we find S. Thomas's great opponent, Roger of York; and that the corrupt, licentious abbot of Canterbury, alluded to by Mr. Froude at page 551, was, as he himself informs us, the host who received the four knights when they came to Canterbury to take the archbishop's life. There were evils and terrible evils in the twelfth century, no doubt, but there were men like S. Bernard, S. Bruno, and S. Thomas to struggle against them.

Mr. Froude then endeavours to show that Becket's life, as archdeacon of Canterbury and chancellor of the kingdom, before he became priest and archbishop, was a very unsaintly one. He speaks of him as a cruel, overbearing man, and in support of the charge he makes Grim say: "The persons that he slew, the persons that he robbed of their property, no one can enumerate. Attended by a large company of knights, he would assail whole communities, destroy cities and towns, villages and farms, and, without remorse or pity, give them to devouring flames" (p. 560). But Grim does not say this—it is a mistranslation. "*Quantis rerum proscritionem intulerit?*" says Grim, which does not mean "how many he robbed," but "on how many he inflicted legal confiscation." Again, Grim uses the words "*aggressor est*," "*delevit*," &c., which mean, "he attacked," "he destroyed"; not "he would attack," "he would destroy." Grim evidently refers to Becket's acts on a single occasion as the king's lieutenant in France, —ruthless acts it may be, but strictly legal and according to the custom

of the time. Mr. Froude admits as much in the second article, where he says (p. 844), "Grim perhaps, when accusing him of rapine and murder, was referring to a suppression of a disturbance in Aquitaine." Even here there is another fallacy: if Grim referred to the suppression of a rebellion, there was no murder; but Mr. Froude is anxious to make S. Thomas a man of blood, and so he twists his own meaning out of the passage, and makes it appear to have been a record of S. Thomas's general habit as chancellor, only hinting, much further on, that it "perhaps" referred to a special occasion.

It is certain that, as a public man, S. Thomas was popular while chancellor, and it would be easy to show that Mr. Froude's attacks upon his character at this period are simple calumny. His biographers very clearly indicate that Becket, notwithstanding the king's efforts to ensnare him, was uncorrupted in the midst of a dissolute court; and, quite incidentally, we learn from more than one passage in contemporary writers, that even then he practised in secret those austerities which became his constant custom in his later life.* Then Mr. Froude would have us believe that when Henry proposed to secure the promotion of the chancellor to the see of Canterbury, in order to carry his ecclesiastical policy into effect, Becket allowed him to believe that, as archbishop, he would be found pliant. "There can be no doubt," says Mr. Froude, "that he must have allowed the king to form his plans without having cautioned him that from himself there was to be looked for nothing but opposition." To our mind, on this point it is better to believe the distinct statement of two at least of his contemporary biographers, than the scientific deductions of Mr. Froude; and if they are right, Henry had distinct warning from Becket's own mouth, and yet persisted in offering the bishopric to him, until his friends persuaded him to accept it. And this persistence was quite of a part with Henry's character and subsequent action. Becket had done him good service as chancellor, and if he could make him archbishop, and then secure his assent to his policy, Church and State would be united in his hands. For such a proceeding he had a living example before him. "Barbarossa," says Mr. Froude, "was finding the value of such a combination in Germany, where, with the Archbishop of Cologne for chancellor of the empire, he was carrying out an ecclesiastical revolution." Barbarossa, in fact, with his primate-chancellor had plunged into schism, and set up a national Church. Becket, having had the primacy forced upon him, foiled Henry's project of setting up a national Church in England.

Then being made archbishop, Becket, if we are to adopt Mr. Froude's theory, played the part of a consummate hypocrite in order to gain influence over the clergy and the people by a false reputation for sanctity.

* Richard Hurrell Froude, whose estimate of S. Thomas is very different from Mr. J. A. Froude's, very justly remarks that we may rely upon what the biographers of S. Thomas tell us of his virtues as chancellor, and points out that, if anything, they would be naturally inclined to depreciate his life in the world in order to heighten the contrast to his life as an ecclesiastic.—"Remains of R. H. Froude," part ii. vol. ii. p. 574.

Now, had this been Becket's policy, he could have found no better means of obtaining his object than by affecting an austere life, yet he kept a rich table, and his severe penances were unknown except to one man, his chaplain, until, on the terrible night after his martyrdom, the monks found the hair shirt under his robes, and the marks of the discipline upon his shoulders. Here, at least, there was neither pretence, ostentation, nor hypocrisy. This charge of playing a part made so recklessly against S. Thomas is enough to show the prejudice that runs through the whole narrative of Mr. Froude. S. Thomas's first act as bishop was to resign the chancellorship. This, says Mr. Froude, was the first step in his ambitious policy of concentrating all the power in the kingdom in his hands,—a very singular step indeed, if this were his object. Had he been the scheming ambitious man he is represented by Mr. Froude to have been, he would have held both the primacy and the chancellorship, and, like Reginald of Cologne, he would have had at once the highest civil and ecclesiastical power in his hands.

Then came the dispute with the king. We cannot enter in detail into Mr. Froude's treatment of it, but we must touch upon some points in order to show the unsoundness of his method. The actual incident which immediately gave rise to it was the homicide or manslaughter committed by the Canon de Brois. With the consent of the spiritual courts, de Brois had paid a fine to the relatives of the deceased; they had declared themselves satisfied, and the matter was at an end. Henry, with an affected zeal for justice, insisted on de Brois being given up to the lay tribunals for punishment. S. Thomas rightly resisted this claim: first because it was his duty to uphold the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts (the only courts, let us remark in passing, which had fixed laws and principles and a regular procedure); secondly, because de Brois had already fully satisfied justice. Mr. Froude, looking at the affair with the eyes of a modern jurist, holds that de Brois had not given any real satisfaction for his crime. He thinks, apparently, that de Brois should have been hanged; he might insist with equally good reason that he should have been tried by a jury at the Central Criminal Court. We must look at the matter, not from our standpoint, but from that of the twelfth century. De Brois, by paying the sum fixed by the relatives of the deceased, had fully satisfied the traditional law of the day, a law at least as old as Alfred's times. So little were our modern ideas on homicide in force in the twelfth century, that in this very reign of Henry II. no man could prosecute another for a homicide unless the prosecutor were connected with the deceased by ties of blood, vassalage, or suzerainty. The affair of de Brois is a test case. Mr. Froude's method of treating it is to judge it by our existing laws and ideas. Is this history?

Mr. Froude endeavours to show that the conflict was one in which the king was from the first anxious for reconciliation, the Pope averse to any resistance, and Becket alone the cause of troubles and dissensions which he wilfully prolonged after any motive for them was at an end. Now, it is abundantly clear, that although at times his desire for peace made him hesitate to push matters to extremities, the Pope never accepted the cus-

toms, and was on Becket's side to the end. "Alexander," says Mr. Froude, "had no liking for Becket. He had known him long, and had no belief in the lately-assumed airs of sanctity" (p. 847). How does Mr. Froude know this? Can he quote a single line from any authority in support of either assumption? Again, he speaks of Alexander as "harrassed on both sides, knowing perfectly well on which side justice lay, yet not daring to accept what, after all that had passed, would be construed into a defeat of the Church" (p. 223). Here there is a perfectly gratuitous assumption that the Pope acted against his conscience. The Pope knew perfectly well that Henry was in the wrong. S. Thomas had written to him from his exile, "Be pleased to read over the Bill of those reprobate usages which he claims against the Church, and on account of which I am banished, and your Holiness will see clearly that before I made any stand he had stopped the mouths of all who would appeal to your court, prohibited all ecclesiastical persons from crossing the sea till an oath had been exacted from them; suffocated the rights of elections; drawn all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, before his own courts; and run his dagger into every liberty of the Church."* As for Henry's desire for reconciliation, it was really a desire to obtain the archbishop's submission. In all the earlier attempts at closing the dispute Henry insisted on the acceptance of the Constitutions of Clarendon. "The 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 12 of these constitutions violated the liberties of the Church in the immunity of the clergy and of its goods, the freedom of its tribunals, elections, and appeals."† The archbishop, therefore, could accept no peace of which their acceptance was a condition. In the conference at Montmartre, brought about by the mediation of King Louis, the Constitutions were not mentioned; S. Thomas, therefore, was ready to come to an agreement with the king, and return to England. He asked Henry for the kiss of peace which would seal the reconciliation, but the king refused it. "Becket knew," says Mr. Froude, "that the kiss must be withheld till he had given proofs that he meant to carry out his engagements" (p. 225). But why should the kiss be withheld? Was this the reason that Henry alleged? No, he told S. Thomas plainly that he had made an oath never to give it to him and could not break it. This wretched pretext was certainly not reassuring, and King Louis had already warned Becket not to return to England without the kiss of peace. The attempt at conciliation failed. Another attempt at Freteval was successful. What were the exact terms of the agreement we do not know. There was a new subject of dispute to be arranged in the violation of the rights of the see of Canterbury by Roger of York having crowned the young king. One would think, from Mr. Froude's narrative, that the Bull allowing Henry to have his son, the young king, crowned by any bishop he might select, was a recent one, but it was really nine years old, and had been issued after the death of Theobald, while the see of Canterbury was vacant. Alexander had sent the bishops an order not to officiate at the coronation, which, however, pro-

* "Vita S. Thomæ," ed. Giles, tom. iii. p. 53.

† Card. Manning's "Miscellanies," vol. i. p. 272.

bably failed to reach them. The violation of the rights of his see must have seemed a serious matter to S. Thomas, when he saw one of his chief rights transferred to the servile prelate who from the outset had sided with the king against the liberties of the Church. He had with him letters of excommunication from the Pope, against Roger of York and the Bishops of London and Salisbury, who had assisted him. Mr. Froude says that at Freteval S. Thomas must have agreed not to publish these bulls : the real question is, not whether he *must have done* it, but whether he *did*. We have no proof that he did ; we have S. Thomas's own direct assertion that the king had consented to this excommunication, and we have the assertions of his biographers that Henry had promised that all who had sown enmity between him and the see of Canterbury should be punished. It seems to us probable that the truth is that Henry at Freteval had consented to the excommunications being issued in the event of Roger and the two bishops refusing satisfaction to the see of Canterbury. On landing in England, however, S. Thomas found the three bishops leagued with Ranulf de Broc, who in his absence had held and despoiled the lands of his see. He had information that they were waiting to search him and seize any bulls of excommunication that he held. Even Mr. Froude allows that this was their design. He at once excommunicated Roger, Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London and Salisbury, and Ranulf de Broc. The step may have been a hasty one, perhaps it was imprudent, but they had given him ample provocation, and his act was fully justified. A new storm immediately burst out, which ended in the martyrdom at Canterbury.

The joy of the people and the greater portion of the nobles and clergy at the return of S. Thomas is a strong testimony in his favour. They felt that he was their champion against the unlimited power of the Crown. Mr. Froude insinuates that he was plotting rebellion ; he gives no proof, and had there been an atom of it, Henry or the four knights would certainly have made the charge. Of the last days of S. Thomas's life we need say little. Even in Mr. Froude's hostile pages the figure of the martyred prelate stands out like that of a giant. It is easy to laugh at his complaints, in his sermon on Christmas Day, that Ranulf de Broc had seized his wine, and cut off the tail of his sumpter mule ; but these were only the latest insults of the man who, as Mr. Froude himself tells us, had swept the harvest off his lands, and left the Palace of Canterbury half empty and desolate. The last scene of all is in itself enough to vindicate the memory of S. Thomas. He was no sensual, worldly-minded, ambitious man, who fell under the swords of Fitzurse and his comrades, saying with his last breath, "In the name of Christ and in the defence of His Church I am ready to die." And we have a further defence of his conduct in the public document by which Henry, in the following words, revoked his claim :—"We, Henry, by the grace of God King of England, &c., publicly and openly revoke, abdicate, renounce, and resign all those evil 'customs' at variance with the ancient liberties of the Church in England, sinfully introduced by us, and we altogether renounce for ourselves and for our heirs, all and every one of them, for which blessed Thomas, late Archbishop of Canterbury, contended even unto death ; and we grant, for our-

selves and our heirs that the church of Canterbury and all other churches in England be free, and have all liberties inviolate as they were used before our coronation."*

We are not surprised at seeing Mr. Froude assailing the memory of the man who asserted these principles and won this victory for the Church, nor, bearing in mind some of Mr. Froude's former performances, are we surprised to find that his narrative is singularly one-sided, and his reasoning most transparently fallacious.

Hours of Thought on Sacred Things. By JAMES MARTINEAU, LL.D.
Second Edition. London: Longmans. 1877.

"TO possess God, a man must first of all be something which *can* possess God." This is the epigraph which Mr. Martineau has set on the title-page of his new volume. The words are happily chosen, not only because they contain pregnant and powerful thought, but still more because they so distinctly point out to us the aim which Mr. Martineau has kept in view. He may count upon winning the interest of persons whose attachment to religion never has, and probably never will be shaken: but these "hours of thought" were meant in the first place, we imagine, for another and, it must be feared, a larger class. How many are there not, who still partake in the services of this or that church, and would shrink from abjuring the system in which they were bred up, but who, just as instinctively, will suffer no interference from their so-called creed in any matter which affects their conduct or their genuine thought and temper? Such men as these are plentiful; and the audience which they make up requires, in the pulpit, a style of eloquence, formerly almost unknown, and at this moment much seldomer to be heard than any one, who should dwell only upon the need there is of it, could conjecture.

For, we suppose, the difficulty of preaching effectively lies not so much in the remoteness of the objects treated from our customary experience, as in their want of affinity with the ideals which we reverence without knowing it. If our ideal world were the same with that which a Christian preacher delineates, surely there would not need such torrents of eloquence to carry us on into the corresponding action. We should admit the truth and force of his presentment; and the coldest logic, arguing from premisses which were to us their own evidence, and have become even a part of our nature, would kindle the imagination as soon as it had convinced the reason. But those who frequent non-Catholic churches on Sunday are far from being all enthusiastic believers; no name can suit them less than that of "the faithful." The scientific method, held in boundless veneration by those who have little skill in it or none at all, has quenched the old enthusiasms, and solemnly refuses to approve whatsoever things it can neither express in a formula, nor derive from material premisses by any calculus. Science has indoctrinated

* "Vita S. Thomæ," vol. ii. p. 267, ed. Giles.

the world with its proper prejudice against the inexplicable: "How shall we allow that to rule over us which declares itself of too high, or too subtle, or too sacred a nature to be exhausted in our definitions?" And the long hours spent in dividing and combining molecules render those whom the scientific method has already biased incapable of feeling respect—to say nothing of devout adoration—for those things which are even less tangible than matter in its ultimate elements. How, then, may the preacher hope to dwell profitably upon themes which no longer appeal to a dominant sense in his hearers? It is true that the modern critic, when at his best, feels disposed to treat all faiths with gentle impartiality, neither hating nor scorning them. But we cannot live religiously, unless, in the presence of divine objects, our critical humour gives place to the simple child-like sense which makes us loving and trustful, and lays every suspicion to sleep. Now this is the very temper—implying as it does an ingenuous belief in goodness—which physical sciences tend to depreciate as the fruit of idle poetry. "This is the misgiving which weakens the present age for great enterprises, and fills it with a certain tolerant sadness, patient of human trusts, but uninspired by them." The age has no heart, or thinks that the heart cannot be, in any sense, a source of knowledge.

Not all who live in a century are of the century—some because they have passed in thought beyond it to a higher world than the world of time; some because its movements have never touched upon their lives. But there must be many now, suffering under the temptations of the critical spirit, who cannot escape moods in which melancholy and cynicism blend together; and how is such a malady to be cured? A demonstration is needed, not that faith in Christ and in the divine goodness is "sweet"—for this every one knows—but that it is "reasonable" as well. The spiritual, however, is not a fiction because physical science cannot reveal it; and if we hold that the lower experiences are true, how is it that we so lightly call the higher in question? Some things we come to know "by observation from without"; but those which alone we can love must be learned "by affection taking up its abode within." "He who has only the ocular perception prides himself on seeing the plain reality just as it is . . . He to whom the eye is but the spirit's instrument feels sure there is no falsehood in his vision, and answers, 'Thou dull mortal, thy lens and retina are good; but there is something opaque which the optician cannot reach.'" The soul's communion with God takes place in such depths of the human and divine life as material science can assuredly never sound, and the existence of which, therefore, it must be incompetent to deny. But that the cynic who has missed the greatness which belongs to humanity,—who can only grow pale and wrathful because love has so wide an influence in the world, and because genius defies explanation, and poetry is ever more attractive to mankind than the cleverest satirical prose—that he should not find a justification for religion is rather to be expected than wondered at. His temper must undergo conversion, before any truths of Christian theology can affect him, or seem worthy that he should take notice of them. Revelation is given to those who feel how much they need it; but now there are very

many educated Protestants, whose training has blunted their religious sensibilities; and it is imperatively required that some potent, and, if such a thing can be, some irresistibly-working agent should render them once more capable of receiving spiritual impressions. They must be taught to appreciate not only science but life, and to read in all things the divine significance which lower and meaner interpretations have so pitifully marred.

Teachers coming from various schools of thought—and we need only mention the names of Emerson, Matthew Arnold, Newman, and George Eliot, to show how various the schools are—have essayed to deal with this unpromising class. The chief effort in all who make the essay must be to convince their audience that the invisible should rule the visible, and that the spiritual life is the noblest which man can pursue. Having to urge elementary principles like these, a teacher, even when he believes in Christianity as a revelation beyond nature, and as containing Divine and super-rational mysteries, will not think it his duty to enlarge upon them. How far Mr. Martineau believes in the supernatural we have no means of guessing; on all such points his words, in this volume, are ambiguous. Occasionally, he falls into serious mistakes, not only as regards the explanations of Holy Scripture which he offers us, but in his view of our Divine Lord. He has uttered some few thoughts which a Catholic will be pained at reading. Moreover, he has now and then strained the general arguments which lead him to enforce the highest motives of religion, so as to deny that lower motives are at all permissible. He will attribute all to love, nothing to fear; and does not enough consider those who are weak, morally inconsistent, of mixed conduct and motive, but yet not to be called vicious-minded. And his language is not so guarded as would seem to be required when making much of God's presence and power in the universe: for the danger of recommending pantheism as the cure of scientific disbelief in God is greater than people are generally apt to imagine. And now we have alluded to nearly all the defects of Mr. Martineau's teaching which we have observed. He shows that he has studied the modern books well and thoroughly; his merits and his shortcomings remind us of Emerson, but we catch in his writings certain tones which Emerson always carefully suppressed in his own, the tones of a very loving and warm heart, much tried, but ever-earnest and faithful.

The book is full of knowledge of life, and of keen metaphysical and ethical reflections. It deserves to be read over and over again, and its argument to be laid to heart. Its main teaching does not admit of refutation, and we are strongly drawn to think there is no subject which is of more importance at present than that of the claims of religion when contrasted with science. Mr. Martineau has given us an admirable treatment of it, for which we cannot but feel deeply grateful. One remark we will add: the principles and the temper of mind, which he takes to be so indispensable for the acquisition of religion, are those which Catholics rest upon to justify their belief that our Lord is the Consubstantial Son of God, and that the Roman Church is the Living Voice of the Holy Ghost.

The Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions. By the Rev. ALFRED WELD, of the Society of Jesus. Burns & Oates. 1877.

THE fathers of the Society of Jesus have so often been accused of an undue leaning to the interests of their own body, that we think it well to remark that the twenty-second volume of the "Quarterly Series" issued under their direction has been reached before the momentous subject of their suppression has been opened. It is true, as F. Weld says in his admirable introduction to this, the first instalment of the shameful tale, "that it is a subject on which a member of the order would for many reasons wish to be silent"; for those who possess the most complete knowledge of its details are bound to present them the most dispassionately to the world, while it is yet a story so full of cruelty, of craft, of malignant hatred to the Church, and we are bound to add of guilt and weakness in its dignitaries, that it is difficult to restrain the overwhelming feelings of indignation which it excites. It has been well done to entrust the telling of this story to F. Weld, and his readers will not fail to appreciate the painstaking research and clear unravelling of thread after thread of the vast conspiracy, which is laid bare to view in its fulness, though with the dignity of historic calm. F. Weld does not either affect to shrink from bringing forward full evidence of the true causes of the hatred borne to the order, which chiefly lay in its being from its earliest beginning a sword against heresy and a bulwark to the Church. He instances the well-known words of Pope Clement XIII. in 1762 to the King of France. "We come once more, Sire, to implore the powerful protection of your Majesty, but it is no longer in favour of the religious of the Society of Jesus alone, or in their interest, that we implore your powerful protection, it is for the sake of religion itself whose cause is intimately bound up with theirs." From the very beginning to its temporary destruction the Society has enjoyed this great testimony, that the destroyers of religion have hated it, and sought its removal as the most vexatious obstacle to their plans. They could neither win it nor overcome; therefore the weapons whetted against its Lord and Head must be fleshed first upon His faithful body-guard. Its fruitfulness, again, F. Weld observes, was another source of the hatred borne to the Society. Wonderful to say, in 1599, the French fathers were able to declare to Henri Quatre that they had educated four hundred thousand boys whose faith and conduct were a living witness to the Church in a very corrupt age. But bad as was that age, there were still worse evils to come, and when Jansenism had spread itself throughout France as the network of tares will spread its roots over a springing field of grain, the Society was sold to the Jansenists by Madame de Pompadour. About the time when this infamous alliance between profligacy and religious error was sealed, the vital blow was given to the order in Portugal by the notorious minister the Marquis de Pombal. Of this remarkable man, Sebastian Joseph Carvalho, no pleasant picture is drawn even by those who conspired with him for their own ends. Gigantic in height, singularly handsome, yet repulsive and coarse in his manners, his associates

found him a rude if not a brutal comrade, overbearing and presumptuous in council, and irrationally violent and headstrong if opposed. When his secret cruelties came to light after his fall, it was found that he had put to death or condemned to cruel imprisonment above nine thousand persons, of whom more than a third part were wholly innocent of crime. Yet for twenty years this violent and vindictive minister, by his boundless audacity and seeming zeal for justice, had been able to give the law to Europe, and to bend even men like the French minister, Choiseul, to his will. The ever-memorable story of the destruction of the Jesuits' work in Paraguay by Pombal's craft is well unfolded in this volume; and it seems impossible that Portugal should not suffer heavily for the wanton cruelties then exercised on those faithful Christian populations, who were driven from their peaceful villages and life of Paradise through the vilest spirit of greed. The representations of the Jesuits at that time, and their imploring petitions for their innocent and defenceless flocks, were of course, largely made use of by Pombal as weapons for the destruction of the Society. Branded as seditious exciters of rebellion to the Portuguese governors, absurdly accused of entering into unhallowed and forbidden commerce, of amassing wealth by the plunder of their flocks, while inciting those flocks to the lowest vices,—even the extraordinary holiness and self-sacrifice of the Jesuits' lives failed to bear them harmless at the Portuguese court. It might be thought that the very absurdity of such charges should have sheltered them from condemnation at Rome; but unhappily there also the jealousy of other orders, and the threats and vast professions of zeal of Pombal, either blinded or terrified those appointed to examine the matter. Pombal finally succeeded in obtaining the appointment of Cardinal Saldanha as Cardinal-Patriarch of Lisbon; when, having forced him into the league against the Jesuits, their colleges were closed, their classes broken up, and house after house was forcibly entered, and the inmates driven into exile. The record of the brutal cruelty accompanying this wholesale expulsion of grey-haired men, worn and aged by their devoted service in foreign missions, is excellently summed up by F. Weld in his clear, unvarnished, but most touching narrative, which should surely move even the enemies of the Society to tears. After enduring a storm of persecution and sufferings in a Catholic country, and from cardinals and prelates of the Church, which could scarcely be surpassed if they had been undergone for the Faith in a pagan land, the Portuguese Jesuit Fathers received their fitting reward. When the disgraced minister, Pombal, had been finally unmasked, dismissed, and, after his death deprived, by some strange chance, of burial for fifty years, the first act of the restored Society in Portugal was to celebrate Mass for the soul of their deadly persecutor and enemy. For, by one of those cycles of events which touch us so marvellously in the history of the Church, Pombal was the first place in which the Jesuits were received again after the Society had been driven from Portugal. It has been well done, therefore, to prefix to this most instructive record these words, "*Maledicimur et benedicimur, persecutionem patimur et sustinemus, blasphemamur et obsecramus.*"

Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus. Historic Facts illustrative of the Labours and Sufferings of its Members in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. By HENRY FOLEY, S. J. Burns & Oates. 1877.

THE two bulky volumes forming the first, second, third, and fourth series of these records, have been sent out from the Manresa or Jesuits' press at Roehampton, with all the care and accuracy of detail for which Mr. Foley is known. The division of series follows the division of the English Province of the Society into "Colleges," as the various Jesuit districts are termed; thus the Colleges of St. Ignatius, St. Aloysius, St. Chad, the Immaculate Conception, the Holy Apostles, and St. Dominic or St. Hugh, represent the London, Lancashire, Staffordshire, Derbyshire, Suffolk, and Lincolnshire districts, in all of which the Jesuit Fathers have faithfully toiled and suffered, and which they have hallowed with their blood. At first sight of these two somewhat ponderous and unwieldy volumes, the reader might perhaps feel inclined to think it a needless labour to follow the record of so many lives which must necessarily have a great sameness, and in many cases the same poverty of detail. But in going through the roll, drawn up with such unwearied and loving patience by B. Foley, of these Colleges, especially where the dearth of Catholics is now most lamentable, and where there are whole districts in which scarcely a single altar is raised for the sacrifice of the Mass, we cannot but be struck with wonder at the number of missions opened and served by the Jesuits in the midst of peril, as well as at their persistent courage and dauntless labours in keeping them up. In the Suffolk college, for instance, we read the names of forty missions or stations under their care, in some of which, as has been over and over again their lot, others have entered into their harvest. Thus, among others, Cossey, Ingatestone, Kelvedon, Sawston, and Thorndon still bear the fruits springing from the seed sown and cherished in the 16th and 17th centuries by the Fathers. The first volume and series of these records contains several very interesting lives; such as those of F. Southwell, F. Morse, and F. Page. The letters of F. Rivers, and the account of F. Campian's seizure at the curious old manor-house of Lyford in Berkshire, part of which is still remaining, must not be passed over, and both these ample volumes lend their clear undoubted testimony to the "cloud of witnesses" who thus, in the Society alone, hallowed their calling by the most laborious apostleship under every circumstance of ignominy and death. We rejoice to find, among the abundant memorials of the English Jesuits, a full account of the death of F. Arrowsmith, and some of the miracles worked by the "Holy Hand." Those who have ever lived in the neighbourhood of Garswood can bear full witness to the numberless cures which the hand of F. Arrowsmith, and the linen which touches it, work from year to year.

Life of Saint Willibrord, Archbishop of Utrecht, and Apostle of Holland.
London: Burns & Oates. 1877.

THE story of the life of the Saxon Saint is founded upon the accounts given by Bede and Alcuin. Willibrord was still living in the time of Bede, and Alcuin wrote only fifty years after the death of the saint, whom he describes as frank and kindly, with a "beaming countenance and a merry heart." During his fifty years of missionary labour, he preached the faith, establishing monasteries, and baptizing the heathen of the fierce northern race, over almost all the wide district of country between the Mæse, the Moselle, and the Rhine. He also passed into "further Friesland, Oldenburg, Hanover, and Holstein, visiting the isle of Heligoland, and perhaps Denmark proper." He came immediately before the time of St. Boniface, and partly contemporary with his labours; and before leaving England he had been brought up from his early boyhood at Ripon, where the great Saint Wilfred was building his new monastery of hewn stone. All this is beautifully told in the narrative before us. It abounds in little graphic life-touches, which make it very pleasant reading. For instance, the incident of Rāthbod's unfinished baptism enlightens us more than many words as to the nature of the men with whom Willibrord had to deal. It was at a late period of his ministry that he entered the dominions of Rāthbod; but before he had set out on his labours, another apostle, Wūlfam, had once almost won over to Christianity the fierce monarch of the Frisons. Already the king had placed one foot in the water, when, stopping suddenly, he asked, "Where, O stranger, do you say that the greater part of my chiefs, my free and noble Frisons are, in the heaven which as a Christian you promise me, or in the hell to which you say all the unchristened must go?" Wūlfam, not concealing the truth, answered that "none but christened men were in heaven"; then said the wild king in anger and scorn, "I would rather, if it be so, go and live for ever with my Frison nobles in hell, than go to heaven in company with a few outcast strangers."

The life of St. Willibrord is followed by a life of St. Lioba or Love, a kinswoman of St. Boniface, who after spending the first years of her life in the nunnery of Wimburn, in Dorsetshire, was called by him to come with some of the sisters and aid him in his labours in Germany. The picture given here of the history of the Saxon virgin is detailed and replete with life, notwithstanding the great distance the world has rolled on since her time. Here we see her, simple and guileless, a nun almost from her childhood, fascinating all who came across her bright path, by the kindness of her loving nature, and winning unsought admiration by her wisdom and learning. There is a great charm about the glimpse of the convent of Wimburn, ruled by the Abbess Tetta, and sheltering no less than five hundred maidens consecrated to God, many of them being princesses and daughters of Danes. It is not surprising to learn that their time was divided between labour, manuscript copying, psalmody, and prayer; but it will surprise some to hear that Lioba learned there the rules of verse, read unceasingly, and composed Latin poetry.

This little volume was written thirty-three years ago, and is only now published with its original frontispiece, a beautiful design of mediæval character by Welby Pugin. All through the book there is easy-flowing pleasant reading, because of the appropriate, simple, Saxon English.

Life-sketch of Sister Clare Boylan, Superior of the Sisters of Charity in Drogheda. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son. 1877.

A NEAR view of a noble character—the briefly given sketch of a life of arduous labour and great holiness, which closed only so lately as the summer of 1876. Sister Clare Boylan was not only distinguished by those hidden merits which proved her a true daughter of St. Vincent ; but also by qualities which caused her to be appreciated, even from a worldly point of view, wherever she went. Strength of mind, untiring energy, prudence and tact, were hers in no ordinary degree ; and thus she was well fitted for her place in an order whose work compels it constantly to mingle with the world. Her labours were not in one but in many lands, but everywhere she was the same, whole-hearted in her work, winning universal love and respect, and succeeding in every undertaking, as if some special blessing attended her steps. During the Crimean War she was in the hospitals of Constantinople. Then, at the age of twenty-four, she was placed in charge of a convent at Smyrna. Next we find her in England, first in the London house at Carlisle-place, where she was engaged in the difficult mission of visiting the poor in their own homes, and inducing them to return to the practice of religion. Only she and another sister were employed in this branch of zealous charity. After two years, Sister Clare was removed to Little Crosby, near Liverpool, a quiet Lancashire village that never let go its faith, and that holds it still, while it lies outside the stir of the world, a Catholic community, with its church, its old stone wayside cross, and its “great house.” From thence, despite the protests and pleadings of priest and people, Sister Clare Boylan was removed to a more active scene, that stood more in need of such help as hers ; and, once again in her own country, she became Superior of the convent at Drogheda, where in the midst of her labours she was suddenly called to her rest.

In the sketch of her work during the Crimean war, we are told that about two hundred Sisters of Charity assisted in ambulance and hospital duties, working when the fearful scourge of the cholera came, from four o'clock in the morning till nine at night. In the case of about one-sixth of these heroines of charity, life itself was sacrificed. At Scutari, at Gallipoli, Athens, and Varna, their chief labours went on. Besides the work in the hospitals, they were accustomed to meet the boats coming in from the Crimea with a “dismal freight of sick and wounded.” Many a soldier's life was rescued by their timely aid, when, the moment a vessel was moored, they “precipitated themselves into the scene of misery below,” where many had already expired during the voyage.

It is sufficient to say that these few pages are the chronicle of the work and virtues of a Sister of Charity, to imply that they are also the record of unremitting self-sacrifice and unconscious heroism.

Miniature Lives of the Saints for Every Day in the Year. Edited by HENRY SEBASTIAN BOWDEN, of the Oratory. London: Burns & Oates. 1877. (In two volumes.)

THIS publication is a happy thought so happily carried out, that the most exacting of readers or critics could not find anything in it that does not merit praise. For many obvious reasons it is a great boon to have at hand the "Lives of the Saints for Every Day in the Year" compressed into two small volumes, written with literary ability that is conspicuous, and "in which great care has been taken to insure historical accuracy." Valuable, however, as the "Lives" are in their collected form, the chief purpose of their publication is to furnish loose leaves for distribution, having on one side a short account of the Saint, and on the other a characteristic virtue, a brief exhortation, a maxim usually of the Saint, and an appropriate text from Scripture. The practice of drawing by lot the name of a Saint, and choosing him as a special patron for a certain time, is a popular devotion; and the Fathers of the Oratory, with whom the custom has prevailed from the time of S. Philip, have compiled the present series with a view of encouraging and extending it. In the preface to the "Lives" we have some interesting examples of the antiquity of the pious exercise. Surius relates in his life of S. Elizabeth of Hungary, that she prayed that she might receive for her patron the virgin Apostle S. John, and that she straightway drew his name three successive times. S. Philip adopted the custom, which was prevalent in his time, and prescribed it for the brothers of the Oratory. S. Francis Borgia, who as Duke of Gandia had practised the devotion in his household, introduced it into the Society of Jesus. We find also that the learned Papebroke, whose talents found adequate scope in the vast *Acta Sanctorum*, compiled a series of lives, with the same intention as that which inspires the series before us. We cannot name another work in the English language which has received so large a contribution of the highest Catholic intelligence as the "Miniature Lives of the Saints." His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, Bishop Hedley, Dr. Newman and other Fathers of the Oratory, Dr. Northcote, Dr. Todd, F. Bridgett, and a host of well-known Catholic writers, have compiled the little work, and have chosen their particular subjects for personal reasons, that have made their contributions offerings of love. Under such circumstances we have nothing to do, but to commend the volumes to our readers, with an earnestness even beyond that which usually accompanies a notice of the best work.

The Paradise of the Christian Soul. Translated from the Latin.
London : Burns & Oates. 1877.

THERE is no prayer-book that could more justly claim to be called *Catholic* than the beautiful compilation of James Merlo Horstius. In every tongue there is some manual, like our own "Garden of the Soul," having a prescriptive and quasi-official authority, which gives it pre-eminence ; but there are none, as far as we know, that have such widespread popularity as the "*Paradisus Animæ*" of Horstius. It has been in use for two centuries and a half, and has gone into all languages. The reason why the book is so highly and widely prized is before us plainly as we turn from page to page : there is no such abundant treasury of devotions to be found elsewhere. We linger over the Instructions on Prayer, the Incomparable Meditations on the Divine Perfections, paraphrases of the Lord's Prayer and of the Psalms, Litanies in verse, and Hymns that are worthy of the Angelic Doctor,—beautiful prayers from all sources and on all subjects. We turn to it again and again, always finding, as in an encyclopedia, something new, and, better still, something edifying ; and while we are surprised at the wonderful book, we are not surprised at its great popularity. There is well-nigh everything in it that is found in other prayer-books, and an immensity of devotional exercises that are found in none except itself. It is probable that many who use the "*Paradise of the Christian Soul*" prize it chiefly for the copiousness and beauty of its prayers, and hymns, and considerations, and some perhaps for the depth of theological thought underlying them ; but it is well to observe that the author wishes those who use his work to understand the carefully-arranged plan, which he fully explains in the introduction. This edition is a new and complete translation, and reflects credit upon the publishers.

Daily Exercises for Devout Christians. By the Rev. T. V. Monk, of the Order of S. Benedict. Edited by a Carmelite Father. Thirteenth Edition. Dublin : W. B. Kelly, 8, Grafton Street. 1877.

THIS is an excellent prayer-book, and its popularity is shown by the fact that it has reached a thirteenth edition. It is unlike the manuals of devotion with which we are most familiar, such as the "Garden of the Soul," the "Key of Heaven," or the "Path to Paradise" ; for, although it has the usual devotions for Mass, Vespers, and other public services, as well as the Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and festivals, complete calendars of feasts and fasting-days, &c., it contains also a very comprehensive collection of *daily exercises* intended for private devotion. We suspect that such prayer-books are very valuable. Many persons of limited time, or means, or education, seldom take into their hands a pious work, or work of any kind, except their prayer-book, and it must be an advantage if, in their chance or scanty readings, excellent instructions

and considerations come before them, such as they would not otherwise find unless in professed works of meditation and spiritual reading. If we had space, we would quote the whole of the instruction given under the title "In Confession" (p. 124), which not only gives admirable advice—in fact, the sum of Gury or Scavini on the five conditions—for a good confession, but also touches off admirably the ordinary faults of penitents. But the whole of the work is very well done, and the publisher has not failed to present it in a form worthy of its excellence.

Association of Prayers for the Return of the Separated Portions of Christendom to Catholic Unity. London: R. WASHBOURNE, 18, Paternoster-row. 1877.

THE papers containing the programme and explaining the purpose of the Association of Prayers will be gladly welcomed by all, whose devotion prompts them to pray for the conversion of those nations that have fallen away from the unity of faith. The Association was originally established by F. Schouvaloff, of the Barnabite Order, for the Conversion of the Oriental schismatics, but it has been widened by F. Tondini, of the same Order, and now comprehends within the scope of its charity all the separated portions of Christendom, particularly the Anglican and other denominations of this country. Such a work we have been long expecting, and for a reason that we shall give. Looking back at the numerous conversions to the faith that have taken place in the last thirty years, it seems to us that the chief factor—plain, though not often pointed out in records of the movement—was prayer. Various reasons have been pointed out as the visible causes of a movement, that was for a time astounding to friend and foe: the influence of some distinguished men, devotion to historic studies, and better acquaintance with Catholics; and without doubt they had their influence. But we cannot say the combination of circumstances which resulted in such a marvellous blessing was fortuitous, and, though below all our investigation will lie the "*altitudo divitiarum sapientiæ et scientiæ Dei*," we think the deepest of fathomable causes is not touched until we have reached prayer. What is commonly known as the Oxford movement was preceded by a sustained and widespread effort of prayer for the conversion of England. The Association of Prayers for the Conversion of England, established by F. Ignatius (Spencer) cannot be altogether forgotten in the land which witnessed its beginning, and was blessed by its fruits. It was started in 1838, and it seems more than a coincidence, that so soon after, the startling events of the Oxford movement came well in sight; and within a few years the number of conversions were so great, that the saintly founder of the Association could incidentally write in a letter to a friend (1846), that he had twelve who had been Anglican clergymen assisting at his mass one day in Oscott. For ten or fifteen years the movement continued "in leaps and bounds," and a reference to the Life of F. Ignatius will show,

with what unflagging energy and singular success, he was preaching on his favourite theme not only at home, but also in France, Belgium, Germany, and Italy. Since 1864, the year of his death, the Association of Prayer has disappeared from our view, and (is it merely a coincidence?), although we are glad to say conversions have not been rare since that time, there has been nothing like that movement, which startled England, and made us think hopefully of a nation's conversion.

The thoughts we have briefly declared, have been in the present writer's mind for some time, and we gladly take the opportunity, that F. Tondini gives us, of welcoming with them the Association of Prayers. Our readers will expend a penny wisely in purchasing the little collection of documents which relate to the Association, or, if they feel an interest in it, in writing to F. Tondini, St. Etheldreda's, 14, Ely-place, Holborn.

Augustin Cochin. By COUNT DE FALLoux, of the French Academy.
Translated from the French by AUGUSTUS CRAVEN. London :
Chapman & Hall, 193, Piccadilly. 1877.

THE appearance of this book brings up sad thoughts. It reminds us that death has taken away the best part of one conspicuous school of Christian men, whose genius and labours have illumined the past forty years of the Church in France. Montalembert, Lacordaire, Perreyve and Ozanam are gone ; their lives are before the world ; "but this group of warriors in the noble cause of faith and freedom would be incomplete without the figure of Augustin Cochin" ; and this work is the carefully executed portrait of the man. M. de Falloux successfully claims our sympathy in the first line, as he reveals the close ties that bound him, not only to the subject of his biography, but to the other members of the brilliant school to which he and Augustin Cochin belonged. "The greatest trial of old age is not to grow old, but to outlive others ; not to feel our strength decaying, or our infirmities increasing, but to perceive solitude and indifference gradually encircling our minds and hearts . . . Although M. Cochin was not of my own age, he had made himself my contemporary so early in life by his activity and his ardent co-operation in the same pursuits as myself, that his loss is to me a wound which no time can heal—a void which nothing can fill up." But besides sympathy, we soon find that we must give the writer the highest praise, and we feel, as we read with unflagging interest to the end, that he has given us, worthily written, the life of a man of rare goodness. "The only excess with which I can reproach Augustin, is being too good," writes his father of him when young, and the child was father of the man.

Augustin Cochin (1823-1872) sprung from one of those ancient families of burgesses which constitute the most solid part of French life. His family has given distinguished names to the magistracy, the bar, and the ecclesiastical order ; among which may be mentioned—nearer to our own time than the remote epoch to which M. de Falloux traces the family

stream—two especially, whose gifts seem to have been transmitted to Augustin Cochin. To Henry Cochin, who lived in the first half of the eighteenth century, is due the credit of having made a revolution in the art of public speaking, by introducing improvisation, at the bar : after his death he was *officially* praised as “the greatest man” the French Bar ever produced. There is also a pleasing sketch of Jean Denys Cochin (1726–1782), Curé of the parish of St. Jacques du Haut Pas. He was a man of intense charity and labours for the poor and infirm. The Cochins were all citizens of the French capital ; and Augustin, like his ancestors, was a true Parisian. Without being quite an idolater, he was an ardent lover of that strange city, lived the greater part of his life in it, had a share in its chequered history during the past half-century, and died in it. He was a mere child when his mother died, yet he always retained a vivid recollection of her, and never perfectly reconciled himself to her loss. A few years after her death he was found in tears, looking fixedly at a rose-bush : “That rose reminds me,” he said, “of my mother ; the sight of anything beautiful makes me think of her” ; and as late as the year 1869 he writes to a friend, “I never, during my whole life, had but one unconquerable desire—the happiness of having a mother.” The death of his father was a terrible grief to him, for rarely has an equal love existed between a father and a son ; but we must leave the record of it to those who read the life. We can hardly point out a period when there was a transition from youth to manhood. At seventeen he is launched into active life, like a ship let go from the stocks, in the main complete, intent on one great aim—the welfare of the poor and the working class. Love of the poor seems to have been an hereditary grace in the Cochins, and to Augustin it descended in the fullest measure. At eighteen years of age he was elected President of the Conference of St. Vincent of Paul in the Faubourg St. Jacques, and also of a society of mutual aid for working men, which he had founded, and he remained faithful to the duties of his office until the end of his life. Such humble and practical work was a forecast of his whole future life. Of course, as time went on, circumstances wove into his short career many incidental purposes and acts that could not be foreseen at the age of eighteen ; but they never changed, and, comparatively speaking, modified very lightly, the pattern of life he contemplated from the beginning. His great and varied gifts naturally found occasions of exercise as he advanced in life ; the intellectual, moral, and even physical conflicts that were around, drew him into the most unlikely situations for a man of his temperament ;—he essayed political life several times, was before the barricades in 1848, sat on Railway Boards, took an active part in Universal Exhibitions, was a contributor to the *Correspondant*, made his mark as a speaker at the Catholic Congress of Malines (1863), and took part in the National Defence (1871),—yet these were mere incidents of his career : the *life* of the man was devotion to the welfare of the poor. His first literary labour speaks for itself : it was a treatise on “The Critical Examination of Pestalozzi’s System of Instruction and Education, in its Relations with the Welfare and Morality of the Poorer Classes.” In 1849 an event of

importance—his marriage with his cousin, Mademoiselle Adeline Benoist d'Azy—kept him away for a short time from his native city, but as soon as he returned he places himself at the disposal of the Superintendent of the Conferences of St. Vincent of Paul, M. Bandon, who was slowly and uncertainly recovering from a dangerous wound received at the Barricades. M. Cochin thus writes:—

"Believe me, I shall never forget St. Vincent de Paul, St. Jacques, and the workmen. I return full of splendid projects, which I lay before you that you may have a right to remind me of them. What I hold most dear on earth, is being a Catholic, and when I ask myself to whom I am indebted for that blessing, I cannot but reply that it is chiefly to St. Vincent de Paul. Your Society was the asylum of my youth. There I found examples, friends, blessings which I shall never forget" (p. 49).

The working of the same predominant spirit carried him heart and soul into the business of the great Exhibition in the Champs Elysées (1855), and it was by his influence that a special jury was appointed to examine what degree of excellence the manufacture of cheap articles had attained. In his report he writes,* "The wretched and unwholesome state of the dwellings of the greater number of the operatives and peasantry is one of the primary causes of misery, of sickness, of abandonment of the family, of vice, of crimes; of this there can be no doubt"; and with great insight, evidently the result of much experience, he shows the bearing of his work on the home-comfort of the poor. His health suffered from labours which extended not only to his special work as president of a jury, but to much self-sacrificing attentions paid to many strangers who were in Paris at the time. He writes to Madame Cochin:—

"I have fed my Dutchmen as decently as possible, and taken them about; they are excellent souls, and Heaven will learn their names, although below it is impossible to pronounce them. People from all countries arrive daily, and most of them fall to my lot: pastors from Geneva, counsellors from Vienna, delegates from Belgium; my door-bell resembles the devil's tail in a famine, there is always some one pulling at it" (p. 94).†

About the same time we find him engaged in other charitable work, which proved to be of the most embarrassing kind. The Little Sisters of the Poor had established an asylum for old men in the Rue du Regard, but they had scarcely settled themselves and their helpless charge, when they received notice to quit. They had given up hope of finding a new asylum, when M. Cochin put his hand to the work. By one of those fortunate events which are not unknown in the records of Catholic charity, although not very usual in the every-day life of the world, funds came in sufficient to purchase another site. M. Cochin opened a subscription for a new house, superintended the building, and on the great day of success inaugurated the new foundation with a discourse

* "Rapport de M. Cochin au jury de la 31^e classe."

† In allusion to the French saying: *Tirer le diable par la queue*, "To have a hard matter to make both ends meet."

that drew tears from a numerous and brilliant assembly. But the work of Christian charity was his vocation. It inspired him to efforts that were wide-spread and fruitful for the abolition of slavery in the different colonies of European nations. When he visited London at the time of the Universal Exhibition, "the splendour of the Crystal Palace charmed, but did not satisfy him; he determined to inquire beyond. The works and reports he read, the garrets he visited, afforded him matter for the serious study of pauperism in England" (p. 117). It would be necessary to transcribe the life in our pages if we aimed at giving an adequate view of his thought and labour for the poor, and therefore we shall be content with one more fact. "The poor continued to have a day of reception (Friday) at his own house; and from the age of eighteen until the day of his death he never failed, when in Paris, to attend what was to him a sacred rendezvous" (p. 98). It is easy to understand the feelings that were touched by a chance expression of the good Sister who nursed him in his last illness. He gently reproached her for the constant attendance she was giving him: "You owe yourself to your five hundred sick, and you must not abandon them for me alone." The nun answered, "Our founder St. Vincent de Paul commanded us also to attend the benefactors of the poor." "Oh!" replied M. Cochin, "benefactor of the poor! What a glorious title! *the only one after which I ever aspired*" (p. 389).

We cannot be far wrong if we find in that death-bed confession why M. Cochin failed to reach the zenith of success in public life, although his gifts were splendid. M. de Falloux says that opportunity and time failed him, for "no one ever heard him speak in public without recognizing in him the promise of a brilliant future." We are not inclined to agree with that view. The revolutions of French political life in the last thirty years have done more than present opportunities to men of real ability for attaining success; and, as a rule, the man that has not made his mark before the fiftieth year of his age is not likely to do so afterwards. Nearer the truth is the inference, we are glad to state, of a Protestant writer in a highly appreciative notice of the life of M. Cochin. He writes, "Augustin Cochin, had he lived an indefinite time, would never have achieved greatness; but had the most conspicuous position been found for him at five-and-thirty, or even earlier, he would have acquitted himself with credit and distinction. Perhaps he was too scrupulous, too honourable, too much of a practical Christian to force his way to the front, and certainly the times were against him."* The Protestant critic seems to be keener than the writer of the life in perceiving the bearing of M. Cochin's character on his public career: he was "too much of a practical Christian." We have strong evidence of his happy incapacity for success—meaning by success what is commonly meant—in the revelation of the "only" title after which he ever aspired; and even in that he does himself some injustice, for he never sought that title save from the declaration of his own conscience. Even his wife was left in ignorance of his good works unless she had a share in them; and if by chance any one

* *Standard*, Sept. 11, 1877.

spoke of any good he had done, he used to remark, "Ah! that's lost for heaven." Our readers can understand why we have dwelt on one view of the man: that one gives his *life*. But there are incidents and episodes varied and interesting enough for the most exacting readers. The names of Montalembert, Dupanloup, Prince Albert de Broglie, Thiers, and other well-known contemporaries of M. Cochin, give interest to the pages of the work. His acquaintance with M. Thiers is well worthy of attention at the present time. They met on the Commission formed in 1850 by M. de Falloux, then Minister of Public Instruction and Ecclesiastical Affairs, for the presentation of a law on the Liberty of Public Instruction. The two men, who were so much alike in their mental gifts that M. Cochin was styled "the Catholic Thiers," formed a lasting friendship. From day to day their friendship grew in the *Salon* of the Rue St. George, and Cochin "introduced questions on religious subjects with a conviction so sincere and penetrating that the discussions which ensued between them often lasted till past midnight" (p. 47). We pass to the last page of Augustin Cochin's life for a proof of the deep earnestness with which he strove for the conversion of the remarkable man who has lately died. On his death-bed he dictated a letter beginning "My Dear President and Friend," which was placed unfinished in the hands of M. Thiers, when the writer was dead. In the first part of the letter M. Cochin writes:—

"You may readily receive it (the truth) from me, for you know that I never belonged to any party, either Republican or Monarchical, but to Jesus Christ alone; whom sooner or later your powerful mind will not fail to acknowledge as the true God, sent down from Heaven to plant the germ of intellectual order and moral regeneration in the world. This is the eternal truth: now here is the truth of the moment such as I see it. You are sufficiently powerful and sufficiently listened to by the country and throughout Europe, to have it in your power to dispose of the destinies of France, and to launch that fair bark into the current of the Republic or into that of the Monarchy for years to come according to your will."

Having earnestly entreated M. Thiers to restore the Monarchy, and quickly, if he wishes "to avoid the disgraceful return of the Empire," the dying man concludes abruptly,—

"You cannot resuscitate the dead; the Republic has been murdered by its own offspring; the horrors of 1793, the imbecility of 1848, and the crimes of 1870 have buried it for ever. It was first stabbed to the heart by Robespierre and Marat, then by that tribe of scribblers, of plotters, of contractors, and of fools, who have thrice attempted to wield the power of the State" (p. 391).

A life of Augustin Cochin must necessarily allude to the exceptional views which brought the party to which he belonged into conflict with those who represent the accepted views of Catholic thought. The work before us will help the reader to judge generously of men who were more "liberal" in their watchwords and principles than in their practical relations to the teaching authority of the Church. Conflicts too often repel those who are opposed, and make their separation seem wider than it is

in reality. And one excuse that is always to be remembered for men like Cochin, Lacordaire, and Ozanam, is the state of slavery in which, as Catholics, they lived. Whatever form the civil power assumed in its endless changes, it never swerved from its purpose of domineering over the Church and thwarting her work. "Shall we never," M. Cochin writes in the *Correspondant* on the suppression of the Society of St. Vincent of Paul, "see in France ten men assembled in the name of God, without believing that they are conspiring? Will this cruel folly never end?" It was no wonder that they panted for a breath of liberty. Their aims in many things were just enough, but unfortunately, in their very struggle for the rights of the Church, they chose as their battle-cry principles which the Church condemns. More we shall not say; but we leave to the reader of this beautiful book the pleasure of finding out for himself how great was Augustin Cochin's love of the Catholic Church, and how enthusiastic his admiration of Pius IX.

The Nature-Myth Theory Untenable from the Scriptural Point of View.
By LORD ARUNDELL OF WARDOUR. London: Burns & Oates. 1877.

THIS very short pamphlet is a criticism on certain points in two articles on "Modern Views on Mythology," by Mr. W. H. Lucas, which appeared in June and July in the pages of our contemporary "The Month." It is a temperate protest against any incautious use of theories which ultimately tend to subvert the inspired narrative of the origin and early history of our race. Those who have read Lord Arundell of Wardour's book on "Tradition with Reference to Mythology" will not need to be told that he shows himself a most competent critic. The general drift of his argument will be gathered from a portion of his preface:—

"If there were no mythic period in the infancy of the human race, or if the facts recorded in Genesis are the facts with which we must commence the inquiry, then the probabilities must be entirely in favour of the Scriptural or historical interpretation of the myths, whereas the whole strength of the 'nature-myth theory' lies in the assumption of the contrary.

"If we cannot, either through revelation or the scientific proof of a mythic era, get grounds to determine what myths are primary, and what are not, then it will be possible at will, after the manner of Dr. Goldhizer, to resolve all history, commencing with the Old Testament, into myth, or else to convert solar mythology into history without check, as Mr. Lucas seems to agree with Mr. Cox in thinking Homer has done in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; but this is a matter which I must leave them to discuss with Mr. Gladstone, who, it must be conceded, has on the other side accumulated a large amount of historical research.

"That a mythic tendency at some time arose in the human mind need not be denied, and that it influenced historical traditions seems to be established by Mr. Lucas's argument; indeed, in some instances he brings valuable attestation; but then this mythic period is not Mr. Max Muller's or Mr. Cox's Mythic period; and before it is possible to argue the points more precisely upon Mr. Lucas's lines, he must fix his mythic period within probable historical limits."

Comets and Meteors ; a Lecture. By the Very Rev. J. B. KAVANAGH, D.D.,
President of Carlow College. Dublin : Joseph Dollard, Printer,
13 & 14, Dame Street. 1877.

DR. KAVANAGH in this interesting and able lecture gives a *résumé* of the recent history of cometary astronomy, to which he has added observations and criticisms of his own. After some brief introductory remarks on the general arrangement of the stellar universe,—each system being surrounded by an immense void,—he proceeds to discuss the origin of comets. They were not, he is of opinion, formed from the primordial nebula from which our own system arose, for had they been so formed, they would have moved approximately in the plane of the ecliptic, and with a direct, not a retrograde motion. "They approach our system from these depths which the telescope declares empty, but which are strewn with that rare nebulous matter of which comets and meteors are formed. I hope to show you that comets and meteors are nebulous matter in different states of condensation ; and that comets at each perihelion passage must dissipate their matter, which condenses into a meteoric stream, and is finally elongated into a ring of meteors, which are carried around the cometary orbit by their initial velocity" (p. 9). He consequently accepts the cometary theory of meteors.

Turning to the interior constitution of comets, Dr. Kavanagh gives an account of the spectroscopic investigations by which it has apparently been proved that they are at least in great part masses of glowing vapours in particular, of the vapour of carbon, and, if meteoric stones are formed from them, of iron, nickel, and other metals which exist in these stones. This would account for the carbonaceous matter which has been found in meteors. But there is, it seems to us, some difficulty in assigning a reason why small bodies such as comets should have retained their intense heat up to the present period, when much larger masses, such as the Earth and Mars, have become almost cold in comparison. Possibly, however, it might be suggested that the heat of the nebulous matter was the result of condensation, and that the condensation of the comets, formed as they were in the interstellar spaces where the attractive forces in operation would be much less energetic, took place at a relatively recent period.

The manner in which the tails of comets are formed is also discussed, the theory adopted being that of MM. Roche and Faye, which attributes them to the threefold influence of gravitation, solar tides, and a repulsive force exercised by the sun. Of the existence and activity of the first two causes there can be no doubt ; the third is of a much more problematical character ; but, nevertheless, Dr. Kavanagh prefers the explanation which is partially based on it to that given by Dr. Tyndall, on the ground that the hypotheses involved in the latter are too numerous, and that it is attended by difficulties of which no reasonable solution has been offered.

These and a variety of correlated and subsidiary points are worked out in Dr. Kavanagh's full and interesting lecture, to which we are glad to draw the attention of our readers.

A Guide to St. Chad's Cathedral Church, Birmingham, compiled by the Rev. WILLIAM GREANEY. Birmingham: E. M. & E. Canning, Snow-hill. 1877.

A VERY interesting little book, which, beside the description of the Cathedral, contains "a short account of the Catholicity of the town before and since the Reformation, and the history of St. Chad's relics." We read here of the building of the first Catholic church in Birmingham, when Protestants generously contributed, as well as the few Catholic families, and the building was given exteriorly the appearance of a factory, lest it might attract too much notice, for this was not long after the famous "Birmingham riots" of 1780. At the close of the last century we have the following account of the state of religion as to Church services in the prosperous town which has been regarded as the capital of the midland district. "In those days the one Mass on Sunday was all the congregation could expect, with an occasional week-day 'Prayers.' Benediction was exceedingly rare, perhaps four or five times a year, and High Mass a thing quite unknown. Once in every three or four years the Bishop came to confirm the few that were prepared. This was an important event." Contrast with this the present state of the same town, with its eight churches, and its magnificent cathedral, and we shall see that Birmingham is no barren soil, but that it was in most fruitful ground that the Franciscans long ago kept alive the faith after the days of persecution. The progress of Catholicity in a great manufacturing centre is briefly but grandly marked in this short record. The description of the Cathedral, which was built only thirty-six years ago, shows it to have been erected and adorned by those who loved the beauty of God's house. It contains many art-treasures in the way of carvings, stained glass, and precious objects for the altar. Amongst these is the statue of the Blessed Virgin, an ancient oak carving from Germany. It has been painted to suit modern taste, and was presented to the Church by A. W. Pugin, Esq. But its chief interest arises from the fact that it is believed to have been the first image of the Blessed Virgin publicly venerated in England since the Reformation. We leave untold for those who will read the book the story of the relics of S. Chad, hidden during the time of persecution, removed from place to place, outraged by soldiers making search, and, at last, in our own days brought to light, and now enshrined for veneration above the high altar of the Cathedral.

Four illustrations add greatly to the interest of the book.

Correspondence.

LIFE OF MARIE LATASTE.

To the Editor of the DUBLIN REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,—While thanking you sincerely for what it is a pleasure to me to regard as a truly appreciative notice of the “Life of Marie Lataste,” in your July number, I would wish to direct your attention to a misstatement which I feel to be of importance as affecting the general character of the series. You speak of me, in laudatory terms, as the “translator” of the Life; but, in the first place, I claim only to be the “editor” of the series; and, in the second place—and this is the point which I consider important—the Life is not a translation but an original work, drawn from the materials referred to in the Advertisement to the volume. In the original prospectus of the series it was distinctly announced that no translation would be admitted, and this announcement has been strictly adhered to; indeed, translations by most competent hands have on more than one occasion been declined. It is the more necessary to make this correction because the error seems to prevail in more than one quarter; probably because a series of “Select Translations for Spiritual Reading” was commenced by me almost contemporaneously with the biographical series, several volumes of which have been issued from time to time.

Yours very faithfully,

EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON.

CHELTENHAM, August 1, 1877.

INDEX.

ACKERMANN (M. L.), *Poésies Philosophiques*, *reviewed*, 339.

AGE OF ELIZABETH (The), 28-68 : popular idea of the reign of Elizabeth, 29 ; its material progress, 29 : the spread of literature, 30 ; the age was also one of immense progress in the Catholic world, 31 ; England's divergence from the Church, 32 ; though the Holy Father was willing to recognize Elizabeth's accession to the throne, 33 ; and she professed to be a Roman Catholic, 33 ; Elizabeth's alliance with Spain, 34 ; the political selfishness of Philip, 35 ; Elizabeth was great and yet mean, 36 ; she favoured Protestantism from a love of supremacy, 37 ; her final separation from the Church, 39 ; the gradual estrangement of England and Spain, 40 ; illegal seizure of Spanish treasure by Elizabeth, 40 ; the inroad of the Turks into Europe, 41 ; Spain their natural antagonist, 42 ; the Turks endeavour to make an alliance with France, 43 ; Philip resolves on a war with the Turks, 45 ; Don Juan of Austria appointed generalissimo, 46 ; the battle of Lepanto the first blow at the power of the Turks, 48 ; but Philip's dilatoriness prevented Don Juan realizing the full advantages of his victory, 49 ; the quarrels between the Catholic princes destroyed the Holy League, 50 ; Don Juan wished to become King of North Africa, but Philip frustrated his design, 51 ; Don Juan appointed Viceroy in Flanders, 53 ; Philip prepares his Armada, 54 ; the character of Sir Philip Sidney, 56 ; comparison between him and Don Juan, 57 ; the defeat of the Armada the commencement of the decadence of the Spanish power, 59 ; the insurrection in Ireland, 60 ; character of its leaders, 61 ; Elizabeth willing to pardon them, 62 ; Philip allies himself with the Irish malcontents, 63 ; dissension sown by the English among the Irish chieftains, 65 ; the Spanish alliance the ruin of the Irish, 65 ; death of Elizabeth, 67 ; the submission of Tyrone, 67 ; dis-appointments of Elizabeth's later years, 68.

Allocation of Pius IX. on the Persecution of the Church and the Holy See by the Italian Government, *reviewed*, 1.

Ansted (Mr. D. T.), *The Channel Islands*, *reviewed*, 283.

ARTIFICIAL MEMORY, 172-190 ; undue importance attached to a good memory, 172 ; on the earlier history of the art of mnemonics, 173 ; classical anecdote on the value of locality in assisting the memory, 174 ;

the assistance the sight is to memory, 175 ; the principles of mnemonics, 175 ; illustrations of those principles, 176 ; Aristotle on Memory, 177 ; different sets of symbols required for different subjects, 178 ; all impressions are aids to memory, 179 ; verse more easily remembered than prose, 179 ; memory highly prized in the classic ages, 180 ; old treatises on mnemonics, 181 ; there is no royal road to the acquisition of a good memory, 181 ; different means devised for remembering facts and dates, 182 ; specimen of Dr. Grey's system, 183 ; Mr. Stokes's works on the subject, 184 ; testimony to their merit, 184 ; the foundation of his system, 185 ; his ideas on the causes of failure, 186 ; we are not disposed to undervalue a good memory, 187 ; though it often misleads its possessor into a false belief in his abilities, 189 ; memory is the most important faculty in education, but it should not be overtaxed, 189 ; we may each construct an art of memory for ourselves, 190.

Arundell of Wardour (Lord), The Nature-Myth Theory untenable from the Scriptural Point of View, *noticed*, 539.

Association of Prayers for the return of the Separated Portions of Christendom to Catholic Unity, *noticed*, 532.

BAGEHOT (Mr. W.), The English Constitution, *reviewed*, 488.

Bellarmino (His Eminence the Cardinal). The Seven Words spoken by Christ on the Cross, *noticed*, 254.

Bilder aus der Petersburger Gesellschaft, *reviewed*, 68.

Blaauw (Mr. W. H.). The Barons' War, *reviewed*, 441.

Bottalla (Rev. F.), De la Souveraine et Infallible Autorité du Pape dans l'Eglise, et dans les rapports avec l'Etat, *noticed*, 234.

Boylan, Life of Sister Clare, Superior of the Sisters of Charity in Drogheda, *noticed*, 530.

Boylesse (Rev. P. Marin le), A Thought for each Day of the Year, *noticed*, 262.

Bowden (Rev. H. S.), Miniature Lives of the Saints, for every Day in the Year, 531.

Brück (Dr. H. von), Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, *noticed*, 248.

CALDERON, The Dramas of, *reviewed*, 94.

CATHOLICITY AND NATIONAL PROSPERITY, 418-441 : Macaulay's contrast of Protestantism with Catholicity, 418 ; the retrogressive tendency of Catholicism always a favourite idea with Protestants, 419 ; M. de Laveleye's statement of his position, 419 ; Baron de Haulleville's reply to M. de Laveleye, 420 ; the seven propositions of M. de Laveleye, 421 ; they are all against Catholicity, 421 ; the connection between Religion and Prosperity, 422 ; M. de Laveleye's false reasoning, 423 ; his injustice to the German Catholics, 424 ; his incorrect comparison between Scotland and Ireland, 425 ; it was the persecution of the Catholics that has caused Ireland to be a relatively poor country, 426 ;

Mr. Hepworth Dixon on the Catholics and Protestants in Switzerland, 427 ; the Protestants in France, 428 ; M. de Laveleye on the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 428 ; M. de Haulleville's reply to the assertion that in a country where there are two religions Protestants are better off than Catholics, 429 ; many of the English colonies were founded by Catholics, 431 ; Canada is still a Catholic country, 432 ; the powerful Protestant nations owe much to the valour of their Catholic soldiers, 433 ; the future of Catholic nations, 434 ; English freedom is attributed to Protestantism, but the foundation was laid by Catholics, 435 ; with regard to education, all the great schools were founded by Catholics, 436 ; education in Catholic countries is diligently fostered, 437 ; Protestant capitals do not contrast favourably in point of morality with the Catholic, 438 ; M. de Laveleye's arguments throughout are uncertain and fallacious, 440 ; M. de Haulleville on the future of Catholicity, 440.

CHANNEL ISLANDS (The), 283-307 : the islands all that now remains to England of the Dukedom of Normandy, 283 ; their history worthy of study, 284 ; their size affects their social condition, 285 ; their picturesque scenery, 286 ; M. Métivier's work on the French patois spoken in the islands, 287 ; dialectic varieties in each of the ten parishes of Guernsey, 288 ; the Norwegian element in the language, 289 ; introduction of Christianity into the islands, 291 ; derivation of the names of the towns, 291 ; the marvellous character of Breton hagiography, 292 ; early life of S. Helier, 293 ; he carries the cross to the islands and performs many miracles there, 294 ; his martyrdom by a band of pirates, 295 ; the early history of Christianity in the islands worthy of record, 295 ; Dr. Latham's remarks on its introduction, 296 ; mediæval history of the islands, 297 ; the parts taken by the islanders during the great Civil War, 298 ; Charles II. then Prince of Wales, takes refuge in Jersey, 299 ; but afterwards goes to France, 300 ; melancholy death of Sir Henry Killigrew, 300 ; the islands surrender to Admiral Blake, 301 ; their history after the Restoration, 302 ; surprise of St. Heliers by the French, 303 ; the political privileges of the islands, 303 ; the laws relating to landed property, 305 ; the mixed character of the present inhabitants, 306 ; abundance of materials for a future historian, 307 ; particularly for a *libro d'oro*, 307.

CHRISTIAN CHARITY AND POLITICAL ECONOMY, 360-386 : Political Economy embraces a long list of false doctrines, 360 ; the connection between Christian Charity and Political Economy, 361 ; sixteen causes of misery, 361 ; on the misery produced by unequal means of production, 362 ; on that from the congestion of population, 363 ; on that from mercantile crises, 365 ; on extravagance in living, 366 ; on the distress caused by the introduction of machinery, 367 ; and by overtime and the employment of women and children, 368 ; the oppression of servants by their employers, 369 ; evils resulting from the agglomeration of vast numbers of workpeople in towns, 370 ; high wages

and pauperism can exist together, 373 ; intemperance one of the chief causes of misery, 373 ; the wide field for charity, 374 ; trades-unions, benefit societies, and savings banks have done much good in averting distress, 375 ; three forces—association, patronage, and legislation—can check the causes of misery, 376 ; how charity can be efficacious, 377 ; conditions of relief, 378 ; the Church always a friend of the poor, 379 ; circumspection required in almsgiving, 380 ; and a thorough organization, 382 ; facilities presented by the Church, 382 ; on the principles of charity, 383 ; charity should be free, 385 ; the Company of S. Elizabeth, 386.

Civilta Cattolica (La), 16 Giugno, 1877, *reviewed*, 1.

Codes et Lois Usuels, *reviewed*, 488.

CORRESPONDENCE : Life of Marie Lataste, 542 ; the Primitive Religion of the City of Rome, 274.

Creighton (Mr. M.), Life of Simon de Montfort, *reviewed*, 441.

— The Age of Elizabeth, *reviewed*, 28.

Crolly (Dr. George), Disputationes Theologicæ de Justitia et Jure ad normam juris municipalis Britannici et Hibernici conformata, *noticed*, 233.

Cushing (Mr. Caleb), The Treaty of Washington ; its Negotiation, Execution, and the Discussions relating thereto, *reviewed*, 488.

DALGAIRNS (Rev. J. B.), A Legend of St. Helier, Hermit in Jersey, *reviewed*, 283.

EAST AND THE WEST : our Dealings with our Neighbours, *reviewed*, 387.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT OF LAST SESSION (The), 146-171 : the lukewarmness of the Conservative party in religious matters, 146 ; the effect of the Act of 1873, 147 ; its worst feature repeated in the Act of 1876, 147 ; disappointment at the amount of power left in the hands of the secular party, 148 ; the destruction of religious teaching one result to be feared, 150 ; danger to the State should that take place, 151 ; secular knowledge not a sufficient substitute for religious influence, 152 ; one result of the Act will be Disestablishment, 153 ; some of the provisions of the Act are improvements on the former Act, 153 ; the recognition of "certified efficient" schools, 154 ; the advantages to Catholics from such recognition, 155 ; conditions for obtaining certificates for such schools, 156 ; certificates of exemption from attendance at school, 157 ; the new power for compelling attendance, 158 ; penalties for non-attendance, 159 ; the day industrial schools, 160 ; Catholic subscriptions to the day schools, 164 ; children must be sent to schools of their own religion, 164 ; on the guardianship of pauper children, 165 ; the illegal pressure put upon Catholic pauper parents, 167 ; the Act provides that all children shall receive at least a primary education, 168 ; benefits Catholics have received from a non-compulsory clause, 169 ; merely

- secular education we fear is on the increase, 170 ; Catholics should protest as a duty against the principles of the Act of 1870, 171 ; hope of a change for the better, 171.
- Elementary Education Act, 1876, *reviewed*, 146.
- FALLOUX (Count de), Augustin Cochin, *noticed*, 534.
- Federalist* (The) on the New Constitution, Written in the year 1788, *reviewed*, 488.
- Foley (Rev. F.), Prospectus of the Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus, Facts illustrative of the Labours and Sufferings of its Members in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, *noticed*, 266.
- Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus, *noticed*, 528.
- Francisco (Don P. de), Discorsi de Sommo Pontefice Pio IX., *noticed*, 1.
- Frassinetti (Very Rev. Joseph), The Consolation of the Devout Soul, *noticed*, 273.
- FRENCH PRESIDENT (THE) AND THE NEW CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES, 488-510 : disappointment at the result of the late elections, 488 ; analysis of the voting, 488 ; what will the Marshal do ? 489 ; the "implied powers" of a President, 489 ; the Presidential Power is paramount, 491 ; and is greater in France than in America, 491 ; four years considered in America as too short for the President to continue in power, 492 ; in France the President must remain in office the whole of his term, 493 ; the course of submission considered, 493 ; anything may happen under a Parliamentary Government, but the French Republic is not one, 494 ; American authorities on the essentials of a Republican Government, 495 ; in England the centre of gravity is the House of Commons, but in a republic there is no such power, 497 ; the Executive power in republics, 499 ; its independence in the United States, 501 ; Mr. Cushing on the power of the President, 503 ; comparison of the power of the French and American Presidents, 506 ; the power of the Senate in the American Republic, 507 ; ministerial responsibility in republics, 508 ; the present crisis in France, 510.
- Froude (Mr. J. A.), The Life and Times of Thomas Becket, *noticed*, 517.
- The Murder of Thomas Becket, *noticed*, 517.
- GALLWEY (Rev. F.), A Funeral Discourse preached in the Church of the Immaculate Conception, Farm Street, London, at the Solemn Dirge in Memory of Cecil, Marchioness of Lothian, *noticed*, 256.
- Greaney (Rev. W.), A Guide to St. Chad's Cathedral Church, Birmingham, *noticed*, 541.
- Greg (Mr. W. R.), The Proletariat on a False Scent, *reviewed*, 360.
- Guide des Electeurs, *reviewed*, 222.
- HALLIWELL (Mr. O.), Chronicle of William de Rishanger of the Barons' War, *reviewed*, 441.
- Happiness (The) of Heaven, *noticed* 258.

Hassoun (Le Patriarch), *Le Schisme Arménien dans ses Rapports avec le Concile Œcumenique, reviewed*, 387.

Haulleville (Baron de), *De l'Avenir des Peuples Catholiques, reviewed*, 418.

Hay (Right Rev. Dr. G.), *The Sincere Christian instructed in the Faith of Christ from the Written Word, noticed*, 244.

HERGENRÖTHER ON CHURCH AND STATE, 308-339: completeness of the work under review, 308; its keynote the defence of the Vatican Decrees, 308: excellence of the translation, 309; the subjects treated of in the work, 310; on the general doctrine of Church and State, 311; in modern days the Church acknowledges the supremacy of the State in spiritual matters, 312; but the sphere of the State must be subordinate to that of the Church, 313; examination of the exact nature of the spiritual power over temporals, 315; on the charge of usurpation by the Mediæval Church, 317; the power of the Church in those days was considered to be almost boundless, 318; she had power to punish as well as to absolve, 319; other rights of the Church, 320; state of society in the Middle Ages, 321; change in the relations between Church and State since the Reformation, 323; now the rights of the Church are absolutely denied, 324; the altered condition of society in recent times relieves the Church of many duties, 325; she now only assumes authority in spiritual matters, 326; on S. Gregory's excommunication of Henry IV. of Germany, 328; the emperor's duplicity and contumacy, 329; the Pope was justified in his proceedings, 330; and used his power with moderation, 330; in the Middle Ages the State acknowledged the pre-eminence of the Church, 331; on the relations between the Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire, 322; on the Popes and their Vassal kingdoms, 332; the Donation of Constantine, 333; Papal sovereignty does not rest upon that Donation, 333; on the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, 334; scripture proof that the doctrine is not new, 335; on the Vatican Council, 336; the objections to the Council are really against the dogma of Infallibility, 336; the relation between the bishops and the Pontiff, 337; on the Syllabus, 338; advantages of a careful perusal of Hergenröther's volumes, 339.

Hergenröther (Dr. J.), *Catholic Church and Christian State, reviewed*, 308.

Horven (M. Van der), *My Return to the Church of Christ, noticed*, 267.

IGNATIEFF, GENERAL, 68-93; the ability of General Ignatieff, 68; the general astuteness of Russian diplomatic agents, 69; Ignatieff's early life and rapid promotion, 71; his services in the treaty with China, 71; the rise of a new school in Russia, 72; the opposition it met with, 72; Ignatieff allies himself with "Young Russia," 72; he is sent to Constantinople, 73; the state of affairs at that place, 74; the difficulties of his position, 75; the relation of Russia towards the Eastern Christians before the Crimean War, 76; General Ignatieff's masterly conduct of affairs, 78; he does all he can to promote among the peasantry a confidence in Russia, 79; while ambassador at the Porte he is suspected of

fomenting the troubles in Bulgaria, 80 ; he endeavours to conciliate the Greeks, 80 ; his popularity in Russia, 81 ; the Western Powers thwart him in the proposed cession of Crete to Greece, 82 ; the Turkish ultimatum to Greece, 83 ; dismay in Greece, 84 ; which country is abandoned by the Russians, 84 ; the ill-feeling of the Russians towards the Greeks, 85 ; although he retains his position, General Ignatieff is in disgrace at home, 86 ; the decadence of French influence at the Porte after the Battle of Sedan, 86 ; the Turks seek another ally, 87 ; the ascendancy of Russian influence at the Porte, 88 ; the abrogation of the Treaty of Paris, 88 ; should General Ignatieff remain at Constantinople, 89 ; he retains his post, 90 ; and is more powerful than ever, 91 ; the danger to the Greek Church from his policy, 92 ; the complete success of his mission to the Porte, 93.

Industrial Schools Act, 1866, *reviewed*, 146.

IS THE ROMAN QUESTION AT AN END, 1-28 ; Catholic rejoicings at the Pope's Jubilee, 1 ; they are a protest against the Italian usurpation of Rome, 1 ; the origin of the Roman Question, 3 ; the Revolution first started it, and has now pretended to solve it, 4 ; the usurpation of Rome, 4 ; its deplorable result, 5 ; English views on the subject, 7 ; and our answer to them, 9 ; from the nature of the Church and the Papacy we deduce the necessity of Papal independence, 11 ; the wonderful vitality of the Church, 12 ; Rome is divinely appointed to be the centre of Catholic unity, 12 ; the world may assail the power of the Church, but it cannot destroy it, 14 ; for fifteen centuries the Pope has been sovereign in Rome, 15 ; he must be either an independent sovereign or an enforced subject, 17 ; the inefficacy of public opinion, 19 ; the persecution of the Church will only last for a time, 20 ; the Italian nation and the Romans desire that Rome should be restored to the Pope, 21 ; hopes of a better future, 23 ; Appendix on Cardinal Manning's new work, 24.

JOLY (M. E. Cretineau), *L'Eglise Romaine en face de la Révolution*, *reviewed*, 1.

KAVANAGH (Very Rev. Dr. J. B.), *Comets and Meteors*, *noticed*, 540.

Kent (Mr. C.), *The Works of Charles Lamb*, *noticed*, 269.

LANGE (Von F. W.), *Geschichte des Materialismus*, *reviewed*, 469.

Laveleye (M. Emile de) *Protestantism and Catholicity in their bearing upon the Liberty and Prosperity of Nations*, *reviewed*, 418.

Lecky (Mr. W. E.), *The History of Rationalism in Europe*, *reviewed*, 191.

Liechtenstein (Princess Marie), *Nova*, *noticed*, 270.

Lataste (Life of Marie), *Lay-Sister of the Congregation of the Sacred Heart*, *noticed*, 261.

MACCARTHY'S CALDERON (Mr. Florence), 94-119 : a threefold attraction in poetry, 94 ; the works of Calderon possess them all, 95 ; Philip IV.'s patronage of letters, 95 ; three periods of the Spanish drama, 96 ; the

early life of Calderon, 97 ; he enters the army and serves in the Low Countries, 97 ; he becomes a priest, 98 ; and is made chaplain to the king, 98 ; his death and burial in San Salvador, 99 ; examination of his works, 101 ; his Autos Sacramentales, 104 ; their sympathy with the national sentiments, 105 ; the religious feelings of the people, 106 ; a Spanish Corpus Christi, 106 ; the theatrical effect of the Autos, 107 ; the improvement made by Lope de Vega, 108 ; the two classes of Calderon's Autos, 109 ; the fidelity of Mr. MacCarthy's translations, 111 ; popular ideas of translations, 112 ; Archbishop Trench's translation of Calderon, 113 ; Calderon's translator should have Calderon's faith, 114 ; the religious character of Calderon's dramas, 116 ; the influence his writings has exercised upon later authors, 117 ; particularly upon French authors, 118 ; his works show that the drama is not opposed to religion, 119 ; all creations of art, if illumined by religion, rise to the height of sublimity, 119.

Mac Carthy (Mr. Florence), Dramas of Calderon ; Tragic, Comic, and Legendary, *reviewed*, 94.

MARSHAL MAC MAHON'S APPEAL TO FRANCE, 222-23 : excitement of opinion regarding the dissolution of the French Chambers, 222 ; the delusion of the English press regarding the Marshal's position, 222 ; dissolution under a Republic and under a Monarchy, 223 ; comparison between Mr. Gladstone's dissolution of the last Parliament and the Marshal's dissolution of the Chamber of Deputies, 224 ; necessity of judging the question according to Republican principles and precedents, 225 ; American authorities, 225 ; what is possible under a Constitutional Kingdom is not under a Republic, 228 ; the electoral prospect, 228 ; the necessary changes of the local administration of France, 228 ; the plain duty of good Frenchmen, 230 ; we do not anticipate a Napoleonic restoration, 230.

Marshal MacMahon's Appeal to France, *reviewed*, 222.

Martineau (Dr. J.), Hours of Thought on Sacred Things, *noticed*, 523.

Maxims and Sayings of the Rev. F. W. Faber, *noticed*, 254.

Métivier (Mr. Georges), Dictionnaire Franco-Normand, *reviewed*, 283.

Mill (Mr. J. S.), On Liberty, *reviewed*, 191.

Mills (Mr. Alexius), The Life of Pope Pius IX., *noticed*, 263.

Milton (John), Areopagitica ; a Speech upon the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing, *reviewed*, 191.

MODERN IDEALS AND THE LIBERTY OF THE PRESS, 191-222 : Milton's advocacy of the liberty of the press, 191 ; Mr. Lecky follows in the same strain, 191 ; we consider a free press a great evil, 193 ; liberty of the press a Liberal war-cry, 193 ; but not a fact on the Continent, except partially, 194 ; and not always at home, 195 ; in the discussion Catholics ought to assume an attitude of superior authority, as having the tradition of history and law on their side, 197 ; the Liberal declares that man's nature has changed essentially, 198 ; we deny that any change has taken place since the Nativity, 199 ; diverging principles

of the Liberal and the Catholic on progress and perfectibility, 200 ; man not intended to be perfect in this life, 201 ; on the modern belief that man is now entering on the day of his perfection, 202 ; self-reliance the motto of the Liberal, 203 ; he believes in intellectual perfectibility but not in saintliness, 204 ; the modern thirst for knowledge, 205 ; the secularism and indifferentism of Liberal civilization, 207 ; a perfect state of society exists only in the stable possession of the highest truths of life, 208 ; Catholic view of liberty dependent on the necessity of a religious synthesis in the social order, 209 ; obligation of society to inculcate religion and morality, 210 ; the security to morality in a Catholic state of society, 212 ; the amount of lawful freedom in inverse ratio to the breadth of the true social synthesis, 214 ; on the need of opposition from error for the vital influence of truth, 216 ; free discussion not required for the vitality and heartfelt acceptance of religious truth, 217 ; Gregory XVI. and the *Mirari Vos*, 219 ; Appendix, 220.

Monk (Rev. T. V.), *Daily Exercises for Devout Christians*, *noticed*, 532.

Montagu (Lord Robert), *Foreign Policy : England and the Eastern Question*, *reviewed*, 387.

MONTFORT (SIMON DE), EARL OF LEICESTER, 441-468 : differences of opinion respecting De Montfort, 441 ; political events previous to his arrival in England, 442 ; misconception of the relations between the Pope and the King of England, 443 ; in the thirteenth century the Pope was the recognized guardian of truth and justice, 444 ; anarchy was so common that the support of the spiritual power was of vital importance, 445 ; early life of De Montfort, 445 ; the jealousy of the English Barons of Simon, 446 ; he marries the King's sister, 447 ; and proceeds to Rome to obtain for his wife a dispensation from a vow of perpetual widowhood which she had taken, 447 ; on his return he is persecuted by the King and flies to France, but he and the King are afterwards reconciled, 448 ; Simon joins the crusade, 449 ; unfounded statement that he was influenced by the Emperor Frederic, 449 ; Grossetete's testimony to Simon's innocence, 450 ; his services to the King at the battle of Taillebourg, 451 ; he is completely reinstated in the King's favour, 451 ; the simplicity of his private life, 452 ; introduction of the Franciscan Order into England, 452 ; Creighton's charges against the Popes, 453 ; Simon is sent to Gascony, 456 ; false charges against him, 457 ; Henry's jealousy of him, 459 ; he disproves the charges, but still Henry is not friendly, 460 ; Simon reduces the French provinces to subjection, 461 ; the struggle between King and Barons, 462 ; Henry's duplicity, 463 ; Simon is made leader of the Barons' party, 463 ; his endeavour to avoid bloodshed, 464 ; he wins the battle of Lewes, 466 ; his moderation afterwards, 467 ; he is denied the support of the Holy See, 468 ; his death in the battle of Evesham, 468 ; he left a glorious memory, 468.

Mulholland (Miss Clara), *Father Huguet's Power of S. Joseph*, *noticed*, 257.

NEUE BILDER AUS DER PETERSBURGER GESELLSCHAFT, *reviewed*, 68.

New Art of Memory (The), *reviewed*, 172.

Newman (Dr. J. H.), The Via Media of the Anglican Church, *noticed*, 511.

O'MAHONY (Dr. T. J.), Summa Summæ : Summæ Theologicæ Divi Thomæ Aquinatis analytico-synthetica Synopsis, *noticed*, 252.

Orleans (The Bishop of), La Charité Chrétienne et ses Œuvres, *reviewed*, 360.

Oxenham (Rev. H. N.), Bishop Hefele's History of the Councils of the Church, *noticed*, 237.

Owen's Education Acts Manual, *reviewed*, 146.

PALMER (Rev. W.), The Patriarch Nicon and the Tzar, *noticed*, 240.

Paradise (The) of the Christian Soul, *noticed*, 532.

Pauli (Reinhold), Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, *reviewed*, 441.

Perin (M. Charles), De la Richesse dans les Sociétés Chrétiennes, *reviewed*, 360.

POETRY (THE) OF A PESSIMIST, 339-360 ; on the German Philosopher's theory of the purposelessness of the world, 339 ; the superficial view of life taken by many modern writers, 340 ; diversity of thought among the Party of Progress, 340 ; melancholy feelings evoked by a perusal of the "Poésies Philosophiques," 341 ; analysis of the poems, 342 ; their startling infidelity, 345 ; the Pessimist view of life, 347 ; poems against War, 350 ; poems on Pascal, 351 ; attack upon Faith, 353 ; the despair shown in "Le Cri," 354 ; to doubt is the first step towards infidelity, 355 ; Faith our strong refuge against such a state, 355 ; whatever mystery there is in our state of existence Faith can make clear, 357 ; Life is not so black as it is sometimes painted, 357 ; many who write in a melancholy strain do not feel it themselves, 358 ; this book was written under the pressure of great grief, 359 ; but even grief with Faith to sustain it will not end in despair, 360.

Preces Xaverianæ, *noticed*, 257.

Prothero (Mr. G. W.), The Life of Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, *reviewed*, 441.

RECENT GERMAN THOUGHT.—ITS INFLUENCE ON MR. TYNDALL, 469-487 :

Professor Tyndall's doctrine that time is a fable and eternity a dream, 469 ; Phenomenism the philosophical doctrine of the day, 470 ; Germany the great school of modern Philosophy, 471 ; Lange's work on Materialism, 471 ; if he believes in nothing else he does in Kant, 742 ; Lange is not the only leader of modern German thought, 472 ; Herr Vaihinger's book, 473 ; analysis of the works of Hartmann and Dühring, 475 ; Vaihinger's account of their philosophy, 476 ; that of Hartmann is a combination of Idealism and Pessimism, 477 ; his interpretation of Materialism, 479 ; Lange is in agreement both with Hartmann and

Dühring, 482; Mr. Leslie Stephen on Materialism and Spiritualism, 484; Lange's deficiency in speculative consistency and thought, 485; the philosophy of despair, 486; Secularism the end and aim of the German Philosophical School, 487.

Recueil des Allocutions, &c. de Pie IX. *reviewed*, 191.

Report of the Committee of Council on Education, *reviewed*, 146.

SANDER (Dr. N.), Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism, *reviewed*, 120.

Schouvaloff (Rev. F.), My Conversion and Vocation, *noticed*, 264.

Shapcote (Miss Emily), Legends of the Blessed Sacrament, gathered from the History of the Church and the Lives of the Saints, *noticed*, 260.

Sheil (Miss), The Eucharistic Year, *noticed*, 258.

Shirley (Dr. W.), Royal and other Historical Letters of the Reign of Henry III. *reviewed*, 441.

Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, *reviewed*, 441.

Spalding (Right Rev. Dr. J. L.), Essays and Reviews, *noticed*, 245; *reviewed*, 418.

Stöckl (Von Albert), Geschichte der Philosophie, *reviewed*, 469.

Stokes (Mr. W.), Memory, *reviewed*, 172.

Story (Joseph, LL.D.), Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, *reviewed*, 488.

TAYLOR (Dr. Jeremy), A Discourse of the Liberty of Propheying, *reviewed*, 191.

TRUE VIEW (THE) OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION. — MR. LEWIS'S TRANSLATION OF SANDER, 120-146: history in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 120; state of Europe at the beginning of the sixteenth century, 121; results of the Reformation, 121; the change in the relations between Church and State, 122; the advent of "freedom of thought," 123; the supremacy of the State in Protestant countries, 123; the long conflict between the Church and the State, 125; the gradual decadence of the former, 126; the Reformation in England, 127; the royal supremacy its central idea, 128; the pillage of the shrine of S. Thomas, 129; the power of the Crown in England in the sixteenth century, 130; laxity of life at that time, even among the clergy, 131; the latter cause one reason of the rapid rise of Protestantism, 132; the two popular theories of the Anglican Reformation, 134; tradition the sustaining power of Protestantism, 135; the authorities on the period of the Reformation, 135; rise of a new school of historians, 136; Lord Macaulay on the character of Henry VIII. and of Cranmer, 137; value of Mr. Brewer's labours, 138; the early life of Nicholas Sander, 139; different estimates of his character, 140; merits of Mr. Lewis's translation of Sander's work, 141; on the paternity of Anne Boleyn, 142; no class of men free of unworthy members, 143; historical value of Sander's work, 145.

TURKEY AND RUSSIA, 387-417 : the invasion of Turkey both in Europe and Asia by Russia, 387 ; base conduct of the Roumanian Government, 388 ; slow advance of the Russians, 389 ; the passive resistance of the Turks, 389 ; the advance of the Russians in Asia, 390 ; they capture Ardahan, but are repulsed at Batoum, 390 ; insurrection in the Caucasus, 392 ; the Russian advance checked, 392 ; they are compelled to abandon the siege of Kars, 393 ; they cross the Danube into the Dobrudja, 394 ; they establish bridges between Simnitsa and Sistova, 395 ; Prince Tcherkaski appointed governor of Bulgaria, 395 ; four courses of action open to the Russians, 396 ; they seize Tirnova and cross the Balkans by the Schipka Pass, 397 ; battle of Plevna and repulse of the Russians, 398 ; the Roumanians join the Russians, 398 ; immense levies ordered by the Russians, 398 ; desperate fighting in the Schipka Pass, 398 ; Osman Pasha fortifies Plevna, which is again fruitlessly assaulted by the Russians, 399 ; defeat of the Turks in Asia, 399 ; the wrong estimation in which the two chief combatants have been held, 400 ; deplorable prospect for the Russian armies, 400 ; does Russia deserve to win ? 401 : a retrospect, 401 ; Russia's false dealing towards Turkey, 402 ; she mobilizes her army, 402 ; the Moscow speech, 403 ; meeting of the conference at Constantinople, 404 ; the impossible demands of Russia, which are rejected unanimously by the Grand Council of Turkey, 404 ; Turkish measures of reform, 405 ; Russia refuses to listen to any delay, 405 ; the London Protocol, 406 ; Russia appends a note to that document, advising Turkey to take certain steps, which Russia herself did all she could to frustrate, 407 ; Turkish willingness for disarmament, 408 ; in our judgment Russia has deserved to fail, 410 ; she was determined to go to war with Turkey, 410 ; whatever Turkey once was, she is now unaggressive, 412 ; while Russia is always aggressive, 413 ; and a persecutor in her own dominions, 414 ; Catholics in Poland especially have felt her heavy hand, 414 ; opposite conduct of the Turkish Government, 415 ; the loyalty of all sects in Turkey to the Government, 417.

Turkey : Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Turkey, presented to both Houses of Parliament, *reviewed*, 387.

VACHINGER (Von Hans), Hartmann, Dühring und Lange, *reviewed*, 469.

WELD (Rev. F.) The Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions, *noticed*, 526.

Westminster (His Eminence the Cardinal), Miscellanies, *noticed*, 231.

Willibrord (Life of St.), Archbishop of Utrecht, and Apostle of Holland, *noticed*, 529.

